

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JUNE 24, 1876.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THE QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION, after some hesitation, has granted a rule nisi with a view to a further inquiry into the cause of Mr. Bravo's death, and the rule will come on to be argued on Monday. The rule moved for was a rule to call upon the coroner to show cause why the inquisition should not be quashed, or why a writ of *melius inquirendum* should not issue to special commissioners. As to the jurisdiction to award a *melius inquirendum*, the court appears to have had no doubt whatever; but with regard to the discretion of the court, the learned judges laid down the reasonable rule that a new inquiry is to be refused unless the court can see that the ends of justice will be practically furthered by such inquiry. As to this the Attorney-General suggests that the examination and cross-examination upon oath of certain witnesses, whose unsworn statements are conflicting, may possibly afford either that ground for preferring a criminal charge which at present does not exist, or a full explanation of the cause of death. It will be for the court to say whether this is sufficient to justify the issue of the writ. Assuming that the court decide in favour of the Crown, before whom, and how, is the new inquiry to be held? Is it to be before the same coroner and jury, before the same coroner and another jury, before another coroner and the same jury, before another coroner and another jury; or before "special commissioners"? And how is the inquiry to be conducted? It is twice said in Jervis on Coroners (pp. 92, 326) that special commissioners proceed, not *super visum corporis*, but on the testimony of "witnesses"; and to the same effect is Burn's Justice of the Peace (30th ed. by Pritchard, vol. 1, p. 1231). On reference to the authority cited, *Rex v. Bunney*, as reported by Salkeld, vol. 1, p. 189, we find it said that the commissioners proceed on "affidavits." But in the same case as reported (much more fully) by Carthew (p. 72), *sub nom. Rex v. Bonny*, the remark upon the mode of taking evidence does not appear. And what is more important, it is evident from that case that the remark, if made at all, was extra-judicial, for the coroner cleared himself, and the writ was denied. *Bunney's case*, therefore, can scarcely be relied on as a guide one way or another. The court will have to make its own practice in the matter.

THE GOVERNMENT have at last set the minds of trade-mark owners at rest by bringing in a Bill to amend the Trade-Mark Registration Act, which has passed through committee in the Lords this week. The Bill is, however, somewhat disingenuous as to the preamble, which, after reciting the section of the Act of last session declaring that, from and after the 1st of July next, a person shall not be entitled to institute any proceedings to prevent infringement of any trade-mark until and unless such trade-mark is registered, proceeds

as follows:—"And whereas by reason of the number of trade-marks, and especially by reason of the difficulties attending the registration of trade-marks in relation to textile fabrics, it has been found impossible to complete the registration of existing trade-marks within the time specified by the said section, and it is therefore expedient to prolong the time for the completion of such registration as aforesaid," &c. Now, in reality, the chief reason why the Act has to be amended is to be found in the inexcusable delay which attended the bringing of the Act into working order. The Act provided that a register office for trade-marks should be established not later than the 1st of January, 1876, and also that the Lord Chancellor might issue general rules to regulate the working of the Act. The office was not opened until the last legal day, and the rules, instead of being issued in the autumn, when they were looked for, were not made public until just when the office opened. The rules provided that an applicant for the registration of a trade-mark must advertise his application in the official paper (*i.e.*, the *Trade-Marks Journal*), and that three months must expire from the date of the first advertisement before the trade-mark was registered. The first number of the *Trade-Marks Journal* did not appear until the 3rd of May, 1876, and then only contained about 150 advertisements, although several thousand applications had then been sent in. The Government must have known as long ago as March last that no trade-mark could possibly be registered before the 1st of July, and yet the Amendment Bill, which was obviously a necessity, is not brought in until the third week in June. The Bill proposes to substitute the 1st of January, 1877, or such subsequent day, not later than the 1st of July, 1877, as may be appointed by Order in Council for the 1st of July next as the date after which the trade-mark, in a proceeding for infringement, must be registered. But the Bill proposes to make another and a very questionable alteration. By the Act various important questions may be submitted to "the court," and where a mark is registered which is not authorized to be so registered under the Act, or if the registrar refuses to enter the name of a person as proprietor of a mark, an application may be made to "the court" to rectify the register. "The court" under the Act is the High Court of Justice. The Bill proposes to transfer the powers vested in "the court" by the Act to the Commissioners of Patents, with a proviso that the commissioners may, if they think fit, for the purpose of settling a principle or otherwise, grant an appeal from their decisions to the Court of Appeal in the form of a special case. The powers vested by the Bill in the Commissioners of Patents are to be exercisable by the Lord Chancellor or the Master of the Rolls or any other two commissioners. If under these provisions the intricate and important questions of law which must crop up in connection with the registration of trade-marks were all to be decided by the Lord Chancellor or the Master of the Rolls in open court, no objection could be raised thereto; but if it is in contemplation that they should be decided by the Attorney and Solicitor-General in the chambers of the former, trade-mark owners would, we imagine, prefer that the powers vested in the High Court under the Act of last session should be exercised by that court.

IT APPEARS from the *Liverpool Mercury* that "some interesting proceedings are likely to arise" out of a recent strike of omnibus drivers and conductors at Liverpool. The men were beaten, and it is stated that they have applied "for summonses against the manager of the company, and against certain drivers and conductors for pursuing their calling on the Lord's-day." It is added that "summonses were granted" under 3 Car. 1, and 29 Car. 2, c. 7. The first of these statutes provides "that no carrier with any horse" may by himself or any other "travell upon Sunday, on pain of

forfeiting twentie shillings for every such offence." The subsequent and better-known Act, 29 Car. 2, c. 7, is more general, for it enacts that no tradesman, artificer, workman, labourer, or other person whatsoever shall do or exercise any work of his "ordinary calling" upon Sunday, "workes of necessity or charity only excepted." As, however, under the Sunday Observance Prosecutions Act, 1871, the consent of a justice of the peace is a condition precedent to the institution of a prosecution under 29 Car. 2, c. 7, it does not seem very likely that the omnibus traffic of Liverpool will be endangered through the putting of that Act into operation. But under 3 Car. 1, c. 2, the prosecutor of the Sunday omnibus would have a better chance. That the Act applies to such a case in terms it would be impossible to deny. And it might, perhaps, be contended that it applies to Sunday trains. In 1824 the driver of a van travelling between London and York was convicted under the statute, and the Court of Queen's Bench, while declining to say anything about the inconvenience of stopping stage coaches, refused to quash the conviction, being of opinion that the statute "ought to receive a liberal (*sic*) construction, being for the better observance of the Lord's-day (*Ex parte Middleton*, 3 B. & C. 164)." It may be supposed that, although justices might convict and fine, the fine might be remitted by the Crown. But the Remission of Penalties Act, 1875, applies in terms only to cases within the Sunday Entertainments Act (21 Geo. 3, c. 49), although the preamble seems to show that the original intention of the Government was that its operation should be general.

A CURIOUS QUESTION was raised in the Probate Division on Tuesday last, in *Prowse v. Spurway*, on a petition to obtain a declaration of the nullity of a marriage alleged to have been solemnized between two minors without their parents' consent. The petition had been presented by the mother of the bridegroom in the name of herself and her husband, she having married again; and the registrar having refused to receive the petition and to issue a citation, on the ground that the mother had no interest in the suit, an application was made to the court to direct a citation. The right to sue was based on the 43 Eliz. c. 2, s. 7, by which a grandfather or grandmother may be made liable to support his or her grandchildren in the event of their becoming chargeable to the parish. In *Sherwood v. Ray* (1 Moo. P. C. 353) the Judicial Committee held that this contingent liability to maintain the issue of a voidable marriage gave the father of one of the parties thereto a sufficient interest in the suit to present a petition to have it declared null and void. In the present instance the registrar had acted on the authority of *Bevan v. McMahon* (2 S. & T. 58), but it was urged that the latter case was distinguishable. There the bride's father had presented the petition and afterwards died, and Sir Cresswell Cresswell held that the suit could not be revived by his widow, since she had no interest therein at its commencement. Here, in the event of her husband's death, the bridegroom's mother might, at some future time, be liable to support the issue of her son's marriage, and it was therefore essential to her interest that any such issue should be declared illegitimate. Sir James Hannen directed a citation to issue, without prejudice to any question which might be raised.

THE HEARING of the *Franconia* case has had a disastrous effect on the progress of *Nisi Prius* work at Westminster during the present sittings. We understand that a day or two ago the list of causes in Middlesex had reached 530, of which it is believed that less than 100 had been disposed of. In London the list of causes is understood to number about 200. There are now exactly three days before the majority of the judges

will go on circuit, and by Wednesday week we shall have only the staff of four judges who remain in town during the circuits. Of these one will be wanted at chambers; so that, at the most, we can only reckon on three *Nisi Prius* courts sitting. Taking the progress of these three courts, on an average, at the rate of fifty cases per week for five weeks, we may calculate that the causes which will be disposed of in Middlesex and London during the circuits cannot much exceed 250.

THE BANKRUPTCY BILL.

II.

We may now discuss the effect of the leading alterations in procedure proposed by this Bill, the purport of which we last week briefly explained.

The governing idea of the framers of the measure appears to have been that bankruptcy is a penalty which should be reserved for contumacious or fraudulent debtors. The debtor may be adjudged a bankrupt if he fails to file a list of his creditors, and the committee of inspection are to furnish to the second meeting of creditors "such information . . . as may be required for the purpose of guiding them in their determination as to whether the debtor ought or ought not to be adjudged bankrupt." The implication seems to be that if the debtor's transactions and statements are satisfactory he shall be discharged; if not, the "stigma of bankruptcy" (as the Bankruptcy Committee term it) shall be inflicted on him. This looks like a retracing of the steps taken by modern legislation on this subject, and a return towards the notion on which the Act of Henry VIII. was founded, that a bankrupt should be deemed a kind of criminal.

But what is this "stigma" which is to have such a terrifying effect on the obstinate debtor, and which it is said to be so unjust to inflict on all debtors who cannot pay their creditors? Will it really afford any terrors? How under the Bill does bankruptcy, which is supposed to be a "stigma," differ from liquidation, which is supposed not to be a stigma? Not in the circumstance that the property of the debtor is divested from him and vested in some one else, for this is to be the effect of the appointment of a trustee under the liquidation; nor in the fact that the bankrupt may be removed from any trusteeship held by him, for it is provided (clause 125) that the order for liquidation is to have this effect; nor, again, in the incapacity to sit and vote in the House of Commons, for the order of liquidation is to vacate the seat of a member of Parliament unless, within a year from its date, the order is revoked or the debts under the liquidation are fully paid and satisfied; nor, it would seem, in the publication of the name of the debtor in the *Gazette*, for it cannot be intended that the names of liquidating debtors shall not appear in that publication. Nor, lastly, would the public examination before the court appear to have much more terror in it for the bankrupt than the first and second meetings of creditors, which are, apparently, both to be held before the court; which the liquidating debtor is to attend, and at which he is to submit to such examination, in respect of his property or his creditors, as may be required by the committee of inspection, trustee, or receiver, or as may be prescribed by rules of court or directed by the court. The liquidating debtor may also, on the application of the trustee or receiver, be summoned before the court and examined on oath. Whether the interval of six months from the first meeting, which must elapse before a bankrupt can obtain his discharge, would be an inducement to avoid bankruptcy depends on the relative length of time which the rules may prescribe between the first and second meetings under the liquidation. The committee recommended "not less than one nor more than two months." If this is adopted the liquidating debtor may be kept for two months, and the bankrupt six, without obtaining his

discharge. It is to be observed, however, that under the bankruptcy the debtor will get his discharge with the assent of a smaller number of creditors than is required to vote the special resolution for his discharge under the liquidation.

It would appear that the "stigma" consists chiefly in the name of bankrupt; but, as we have before pointed out, the result of modern legislation has been largely to remove this special stigma, by including under the designation of bankrupt honest debtors who, by unavoidable misfortune, have become unable to pay their debts. At present the term "bankrupt" carries with it, we believe, in popular estimation, no greater idea of moral delinquency than the term "liquidating debtor"; and whether it will be possible to convert it into a name of opprobrium within the present generation seems doubtful. If not, even the sentimental objection to the term has no force. Are there any substantial reasons for the proposed reversal of the course hitherto adopted of regarding the adjudication of bankruptcy as the normal proceeding, and liquidation without bankruptcy as a mode to be adopted if desired by the creditors? The committee seem to urge as a reason that proceedings in bankruptcy are commenced by the action of a single creditor, and "a dilatory and expensive contest is sometimes carried on as to whether or not adjudication of bankruptcy shall be made, and the adjudication is often set aside by the action of the body of creditors as soon as they can exercise the powers of section 28," i.e., upon the acceptance of a composition. But may not the very same results flow from the action of a single creditor in presenting a petition for an order of liquidation? The petition may be contested, and the order of liquidation may, on the acceptance of a composition, be revoked by the court. The change in the preliminary proceedings seems to us to be uncalled for. No real benefit can result from it, either to the debtor or his creditors.

Passing from this, we come next to the revival of the provisions of the Act of 1861 with regard to the order *nisi* in the case of a trader. This may be fair to the trader, but does it not actually hold out an inducement to the delay and expense of which the committee complain? The order *nisi* is to be revoked if the debtor, within the time prescribed, shows that either the proof of the petitioning creditor's debt, or of the trading, or of the act of bankruptcy is insufficient. It will be singular if this provision does not occasion as much, if not more, litigation than has ever taken place at the same stage under the existing law.

But what are we to say to the provisional committee of the five largest creditors (not secured to the extent of half the amount of their debts), resident in England, who are to do nothing without the sanction of the court? Is it likely that five creditors, resident it may be in different parts of England, knowing nothing of each other, and probably deeply immersed in business, will take the trouble to meet to discuss the directions to be given to the receiver (probably an officer of the court), only to find that they must select a solicitor to apply to the court for sanction to their directions. Who is to pay for such applications? Who is to summon the meetings of the five creditors, and what is to be done if the five creditors refuse to act?

Next comes the preliminary meeting of creditors. The creditors are to "attend and discuss and investigate in the prescribed manner the affairs of the debtor." Since the debtor is not, so far as we can gather from the Bill, to furnish any statement of his affairs to this meeting, it will be interesting to see the manner which the rules will "prescribe" for this discussion and investigation. The creditors are not to do anything; so far as appears, they are not to have any information afforded (for no committee of inspection will then exist to require the bankrupt to submit to any examination); but they are to have the inestimable advantage of becoming familiar with the personal appearance of the debtor. He is to attend this meeting, and it is to be hoped he will make

himself pleasant to his creditors. Is there any substantial objection to the debtor's being required to file a statement of his affairs with the list of creditors? If the preliminary meeting is to be held at all, it can only be made useful by some such provision as this. Observe that by this provision there is added to the costs of the liquidation all the expense of "the prescribed notices" to all the persons in the debtor's list of creditors of the time and place of this preliminary meeting, and of the holding of the meeting.

Now we come to the first meeting, at which the creditors are to prove their debts and appoint the committee of inspection. This is to be held before the court. Though we know that many high authorities differ with us, our own impression is strong in favour of the "public meeting system." Creditors are less constrained and more inclined to discuss with freedom the affairs of the debtor outside the court than within it; and the benefits supposed to be derived from the presidency of a registrar, who is usually occupied with other matters, seem to us illusory. The committee of inspection are invested with full power to superintend the liquidation and to examine the debtor and obtain information as to his affairs. As regards the powers of the Committee of Inspection, we think the proposal is an improvement on the present system; but will the appointment of the trustee by the committee, instead of by the creditors, put a stop to the evils attending the abuse of proxies? We throw not. The contest will, of course, be as to the appointment of the members of the committee of inspection (who are not to exceed five in number), and if candidates for the office of trustee, or the debtor's solicitor, do not find means of using proxies so as to have a committee appointed favourable to their views, they will be less astute than we imagine them to be. The provision in clause 23, enabling the court, in case it appears to the satisfaction of the court that any solicitation has been used by or on behalf of the trustee or receiver either in obtaining proxies or in obtaining employment, to order, "if it shall think fit," that no remuneration is to be allowed, looks stringent on paper, but in practice, since an application will have to be made to the court to put it in force, evidence will have to be adduced, and the hardship of depriving a man of remuneration for work which he may have efficiently performed will be involved, and the remedy may not be found so efficacious as it is imagined to be.

(To be continued.)

ARBITRATION UNDER THE LANDS CLAUSES ACT.

THE decision in *Rhodes v. Airedale Drainage Commissioners* has been overruled by the Court of Appeal. The Court of Common Pleas decided that an umpire under the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act had no power to state his award in the form of a special case. The Court of Appeal has held that, at any rate, when each side appoints an arbitrator under the Lands Clauses Act, there is power to state a special case, because there is then a submission by consent of both parties within the Common Law Procedure Act. It should be remembered, in justice to the court below, that they decided on the authority of a case of *In re Newbold* (14 C. B. N. S. 405), which of course was not binding on the Court of Appeal, and it appears that certain authorities in the Court of Chancery to the contrary were not brought to their notice. We are rejoiced to find that the question is now settled in a manner consistent with convenience and reason, though the result of the decision has been to suggest grave difficulties to which we shall hereafter refer.

On a previous occasion we remarked at some length on the great inconvenience produced by the doctrine of *In re Newbold*. The difficulty has been that

it has been said that the arbitrator has no power to go into the question whether damage laid before him is a proper subject of compensation, but only to determine the *quantum* of damage sustained; and that it is only when the action on the award is brought that the question of what damage is the proper subject of compensation can be raised. This involves the expense of two inquiries. The Common Pleas Division, when *Rhodes' case* came before them on the second occasion on motion to enter a nonsuit, to some extent got over the difficulty by deciding that the award of the umpire was some evidence *prima facie* of the existence of damage, the proper subject of compensation, and shifted on the other party the *onus* of showing that the award was wholly or partly in respect of damage not the subject of compensation. The Court of Appeal, though not in terms overruling this decision, because the reversal of the previous decision made it unnecessary to do so, have intimated very strongly that they were not convinced of its soundness. It is obviously most illogical to make the award itself *prima facie* evidence on a question which it was not in the arbitrator's jurisdiction to entertain. But the convenience of the decision was very considerable, and the absurdities of the contrary result very great, as shown in argument in the court below. Still, in principle, the Court of Appeal seem to be right on this point, if it be true that the arbitrator's jurisdiction is only as to *quantum*. The evils of this result, however, are very much diminished by the decision that the arbitrators can state a special case; for if any point of doubt arises as to damage, a case may be stated with regard to it, and probably both parties would acquiesce in the decision of that case.

We do not see, however (and here arise the difficulties we mentioned), that the defendant is bound in any way by the findings of the arbitrator in the special case, when the action is brought on the award; and we must admit that the Court of Appeal seem to have overlooked several important considerations in the way of their decision. The whole argument appears to have been made to turn on the question whether the Common Law Procedure Act applied to the reference. This is but the threshold of the difficulty. If it is true that the arbitrator's province is only to ascertain the *quantum* of damages laid before him, as has been asserted over and over again in many cases, we do not see how in strictness the special case can decide between the parties the points as to which the principal necessity for stating it arises. It seems to us a breach of logic quite as great as that which has been alleged against the Common Pleas judgment, that the umpire should have power to state a case on a point which was not included in his jurisdiction. The question he substantially asks by his award in the form of a case is, What is the proper subject for which I am to award compensation? But the hypothesis is that he is not to award compensation at all, but only to fix *quantum* of damages alleged by the plaintiff. The question is not one of mere form; it is a vital one with regard to the powers and position of the arbitrator. The present position of the law as generally alleged, and indeed admitted and urged by the defendants' argument, is that the arbitrator is to fix the amount only; the tribunal before which the action on the award is brought is the proper judge of the question whether such facts exist as would have given a right to an action for damages if the Act had not been passed. A jury is to say whether the facts existed. The court is to say whether they amounted to actionable damage. But if there is, in the proper sense of the term, power to state a special case, the findings of the arbitrator on the facts will conclude the parties. This is giving the arbitrator more than jurisdiction merely to determine *quantum*. The defendants have power in their pleadings in the action to deny that any actionable damage existed; and this, if we mistake not, puts the plaintiff to proof of the facts on which such damage depends, and we cannot see that the umpire's power to state a special case alters this, or that the case, when stated, prevents the defendants from

doing this, or makes the matter *res judicata*. (We are speaking now on the assumption that the Common Pleas were wrong in holding the umpire's award evidence.)

It seems to us doubtful, in fact, whether the judgment of the Court of Appeal does not, theoretically, leave the law on the subject in greater confusion than ever, though, as we have before said, we expect that, practically speaking, parties will often agree to decide the matter by the decision of the court on the special case. We are sorry, however, that the Court of Appeal did not look into the whole matter more carefully, and settle the law with a view to all these difficulties. It may be that the *dicta* which regard the arbitrator as a mere substitute for a compensation jury might be open to re-consideration, though the *Duke of Buccleugh's case* and other cases seem to have established that the arbitrator has not general jurisdiction to award compensation. It may well be that if the arbitrator is not a mere substitute for a compensation jury, and has jurisdiction over more than the mere question of *quantum*, the decision of the Common Pleas Division as to the effect of his award in evidence is right. But we confess we are altogether puzzled as to what state the law is left in by the decision of the Court of Appeal. How can there be jurisdiction to state a case on a question which there was no jurisdiction in the arbitrator to entertain? On the other hand, if he had jurisdiction to entertain it, this is contrary to notions that have been generally current in the profession for very long. It may be observed that the decision of the Common Pleas Division, that the award was evidence of actionable damage, only obviated the difficulty in cases where the defendant does not bring evidence affirmatively that the damage did not exist. When he does, two inquiries must still take place.

It seems to us that the proper result, if on the authorities and Acts it is open, would be one which would give the arbitrators power to decide between the parties, and to decide conclusively all questions of fact relating to the existence of damage, not merely as to *quantum*. If this was their position, why should it not lie on the party refusing to pay according to the award to prove excess of jurisdiction, as in the case of any other award? In the case of ordinary awards such and such a matter is submitted to the arbitrator. It does not lie on the plaintiff to show that he confined himself to that, but on the other side to show that he did not. This would leave it for the plaintiff to prove affirmatively everything except existence of actionable damage; for instance, that he was the party entitled to the damage, and so forth. The arbitrator's province would then be to inquire what is the amount of the damage for which the statute gives compensation, not merely to estimate *quantum* of damage claimed on the one hand, or to say what the statute does give compensation for on the other. Why should it be necessary to prove affirmatively that he has rightly construed the submission and kept within it, any more than in the case of any other arbitrator? It is to be observed that the want of logic alleged against the Common Pleas judgment does not in this view arise. If the arbitrator is only to determine *quantum* of damage submitted to him, and has no power to exercise any discretion as to what sort of damage he will accept and reject, of course it is illogical to suggest that his award is *prima facie* evidence of jurisdiction. But is it clear that this is his position? It seems to us that at present considerable confusion exists from the vague use of terms and analogies without looking to substance and working out clear conceptions. Why is it not perfectly reasonable to say that the arbitrator's commission is to determine what damages, the subject of legal compensation, exist? It is as if full statements in the concrete of what is legal damage were written out in the submission, and he was to be asked, Do these exist? It may be said that the submission (which here is the Act and the appointment) expresses this compendiously by saying, Ascertain the amount of actionable damage, it being assumed that everybody knows what is by law actionable damage. If

the arbitrator misconstrues the submission by reason of not knowing what the compendious expression includes, he may be set right by the court, as every other arbitrator may, but *prima facie* he is to be taken to have followed the submission, and to have acted within his jurisdiction. In ordinary references, no doubt, the determination of the law lies on the arbitrator, but what we suggest is that the question for the arbitrator here is only whether damages of a certain class exist. The limits of that class are laid down by the law, and, no doubt, even upon our suggestion, the arbitrator must act on his view as to what the law does so include in the first instance. But it appears to us that this is only analogous to what every arbitrator must do in construing his order of reference or submission, and that he ought to be subject to review as to this by the court, just as any other arbitrator is. This view would be working out the judgment of the Court of Appeal further in bringing these references within the Common Law Procedure Act, and would reconcile the decision of the Court of Appeal as to the power to state a case, with that of the Common Pleas as to the effect of the award in evidence.

The New Practice.

THE SEMI-DEFUNCT TERMS.

A MATTER has recently been brought before the courts with respect to which it does not appear to us that the provisions of the Judicature Act are altogether satisfactory. It will be remembered that the new legislation, though it abolished terms for most purposes, still makes the times of the commencement and termination of the old terms material for certain purposes. When the time for the taking of certain steps or the doing of certain acts was computed before the Judicature Act with reference to the then existing terms the time for taking such steps or doing such acts has still in many cases to be computed with reference to what would have been the old terms if they had continued to exist. For instance, a motion to set aside an award had to be made before the end of a certain term. It must still be made before what would have been the end of the term under the old system. This appears to us to be a bad arrangement. It is calculated to lead to slips and oversights, and to form a trap for the unwary. It was a natural arrangement when business was divided generally into certain periods that the limit of time for doing an act should be fixed with reference to such periods. The attention of practitioners was naturally called to the end of such periods with reference to business generally, and they were thus inevitably led to consider what particular business must be attended to within a certain limit of time. Now, though the sittings may be in full swing and business generally going on, it is necessary to call to mind a certain period which has become obsolete for business in general with reference to the transaction of certain particular business.

We do not see why the new sittings should not, for most if not for all purposes, replace the old terms. No doubt this would, in many cases, extend the time for taking steps, which it may be urged was already long enough. But this extension would not be very long, and we think, notwithstanding the objection, that such an arrangement would be better than the present one. If this suggestion is inadmissible, rules should be made fixing a definite period for taking the steps which were formerly to be taken with reference to terms. It was reasonable enough when the rules establishing a great revolution in procedure were to be framed, and more especially when those rules were to be inserted in the schedule to the Act, that such a matter of detail as that to which we allude should be left as provided for in the Act itself, by the temporary expedient of preserving the old arrangement for certain limited purposes. The

Act would otherwise have been overwhelmed with details. But as time goes on it will be natural that various small finishing details should be added by the rules of practice which the judges are empowered to make; and we think, when any fresh rules are made, the matter which has formed the subject of these remarks might well be considered, with a view to some more convenient and symmetrical arrangement being adopted.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

IN A CASE of *Dymond v. Croft*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 13th inst., there had been a substituted service of the writ of summons on the defendant. The date of the service was not indorsed upon the writ in pursuance of ord. 9, r. 13. Judgment by default having been obtained the registrar refused to draw up the judgment in consequence of the date of service not having been indorsed. *Cosens Hardy* now mentioned the matter to the Master of the Rolls, and referred his lordship to a decision of Mr. Baron Huddleston in chambers in the case of *Cruse v. Kuttingell* (ante, p. 141), in which his lordship had ordered the judgment officer to sign judgment in a similar case of substituted service, without requiring the indorsement of the date of service. The Master of the Rolls said that the rule was perfectly plain. Service must include substituted as well as ordinary service. Had it not been for the existence of the case to which he was referred he should have thought the rule was too plain to admit of such a case being so decided. He must decline to follow that case.

APPLICATION FOR ACCOUNT BEFORE APPEARANCE—ORD. 15, RR. 1, 2.—On the 21st inst., at the Rolls, the plaintiff in a creditor's action for administration (*Re Plant, deceased, Hazell v. Hodgson*), in which the writ was indorsed under ord. 3, r. 8, moved *ex parte* before the defendants had appeared for leave to serve notice of motion for the next motion day to have the preliminary accounts and inquiries taken. The plaintiff, whose writ had been issued on the 20th inst., was apprehensive that judgment would be obtained in a pending action in a common law division against the executors. The applicant's counsel submitted that there being two clear days' notice of motion, appearance by the defendant could be dispensed with. The Master of the Rolls, however, considered that it was impossible (even if the application could, having regard to ord. 15, r. 2, be made by motion) to proceed under the order unless the defendant had either appeared or made default. His lordship observed that the procedure in cases of common account was, by ord. 3, r. 8, and ord. 15, assimilated to that upon specially-indorsed writs, enabling the judge in very simple cases to make a final order without going through the form of an action throughout. It was impossible, therefore, to make the order unless the rules were complied with.

CROSS-EXAMINATION UPON MOTION—DISCRETION—ORD. 37, R. 2.—In an action of *Stete v. Bishop Stortford Local Board*, on the 21st inst., application was made to the Master of the Rolls for an order for the attendance for cross-examination, at the hearing of a motion, of a person who had made an affidavit upon the motion. His lordship said that cross-examination of witnesses upon a motion was not a matter of course, and made an order that the deponent attend to be cross-examined if the court thought fit.

PLEADINGS—ORD. 19, R. 4.—Before the Common Pleas Division on the 19th inst., the case of *Breslau v. Barwick* came on upon a demurrer to a reply. The plaintiff, in his statement of claim, alleged that the defendant chartered to the plaintiff his steamer *The German Emperor* by a charter-party dated February 27, 1875, which charter-party contained a clause that if either party failed to perform his part of the agreement, he should pay to the other £750 as ascertained damages without proof of actual damage; that the defendant failed to per-

form his part of the agreement, wherefore the plaintiff claimed £750. The defendant pleaded that no such charter-party was ever entered into by the plaintiff or the defendant; but that the supposed charter-party relied on in the statement of claim was between Messrs. Barnett Brothers and a company called the Tharsis Sulphur and Copper Company; that Barnett Brothers were not authorized to act as agents for the defendant; or, if at all, only as agents to make a charter-party in the usual form with the plaintiff and not with the Tharsis Sulphur and Copper Company; and that the charter-party sued on contained divers unusual and improper clauses, amongst others, the one fixing the damages at £750, under which the plaintiff claimed. The plaintiff joined issue, and also replied that Barnett Brothers were the duly authorized agents of the defendant, and that through them the defendant agreed to charter *The German Emperor* to the plaintiff on the terms and conditions set out in the charter-party mentioned in the statement of claim, which was drawn up for that purpose. But "in drawing it up one of the printed forms belonging to the Tharsis Sulphur and Copper Company (Limited), in which their name was printed as charterer, was, through the inadvertence of plaintiff and defendant made use of, and by the mistake and oversight of the plaintiff and the defendant the name so printed as charterer was omitted to be struck out, and remained in the charter-party as and instead of plaintiff's name. The plaintiff was not agent for the Tharsis Sulphur and Copper Company in effecting the charter. The company was not intended to be, and was not, the charterer, or in any way concerned in the business, and their name appears only in consequence of the before-mentioned mistake, and as representing plaintiff's name. The charter-party as drawn up was signed by the plaintiff in his own name as charterer, and by the defendants (through their agents) as owners of *The German Emperor*, and it was intended by and agreed between the plaintiff and defendant that the plaintiff should be liable on and entitled to the benefit of the charter-party drawn up as aforesaid." To this paragraph of the reply the defendant demurred. *Bray*, for the defendant, urged that the reply introduced a variance into the pleadings, for the statement of claim declared on a charter-party made between plaintiff and defendant, while the reply admitted that the charter-party was made between the Tharsis Company and the plaintiff. The facts stated in the reply might entitle the plaintiff to have the deed reformed; but he never asked to have the deed reformed either in his statement of claim or in his reply; and ord. 19, r. 2, required that he should state the relief or remedy to which he claimed to be entitled. If the plaintiff were allowed to recover on the charter-party not reformed, the Tharsis Company might afterwards sue the defendant over again. *French*, for the plaintiff, argued that there was no need to reform the charter-party, as he relied solely upon his common law rights. The parties to a contract are those who entered into it, and who intended to be bound by it; hence the statement of claim was right in substance when it said this charter-party was made between the plaintiff and defendant; and the replication was not at variance with it, as it did but explain away an apparent discrepancy. The court (*Brett and Grove, JJ.*) decided that the facts stated in the reply ought to have been set out in the statement of claim, as they were material facts upon which the plaintiff relied (ord. 19, r. 4). Not being so set out, the defendant should have simply joined issue upon them, and that would have compelled the plaintiff to amend. Instead of doing that the defendant set up a colourable defence, which, on this demurrer, they must take to be an erroneous statement of facts. This obliged the plaintiff to have recourse to the reply demurred to. A second pleading must add some fact which was not in the first, and which tended to support the first pleading, and not to contradict it. This reply certainly fulfilled those requirements, as it showed that the agreement was drawn up erroneously by mutual mistake of the parties. Nor was it necessary that it should anywhere ask for a rectification of the charter-party. For it was decided in *Moslyn v. West Moslyn Coal and Iron Company* (24 W. R. 401) that when the facts showed that the deed ought to be rectified the court would treat it as rectified, and that there was no need to go through the manual labour of striking the pen through the words erroneously inserted. And there

was no fear of the Tharsis Company ever recovering in an action on the charter-party if the facts stated in the reply were true. The demurrer was accordingly overruled.

SERVICE OF WRIT BY ADVERTISEMENT.—In the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division, on the 20th inst., *Candy* moved, in the case of *Whitley v. Honeywell*, for an order for substituted service of the writ of summons upon one of the defendants, who was the son-in-law of the testatrix. His wife was contesting the will on the ground of her mother's intestacy, but the parties were living apart, and neither the wife nor the husband's solicitors knew his address. The President of the division granted the application. He said that, under the old practice, the substituted service would have been by advertisement. By ord. 9, r. 2, the court or a judge had a general power of directing the method of substituted service. This included service by advertisement, the power formerly exercised by the Probate and Divorce Court being now extended to all the divisions. The order would be that the writ be advertised, subject to the directions of the registrar.

Reviews.

TRADE-MARKS.

THE LAW OF TRADE-MARKS: INCLUDING THE MERCHANDISE MARKS ACT, 1862, AND THE TRADE-MARKS REGISTRATION ACT, 1875. BY J. BIGLAND WOOD, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons.

THE TRADE-MARK REGISTRATION ACT, 1875, AND THE RULES THEREUNDER: TOGETHER WITH THE MERCHANDISE MARKS ACT, 1862. BY EDWARD MORTON DANIEL, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Haynes.

The Trade-Mark Registration Act of last year, by enacting compulsory registration of trade-marks as a *sine qua non* to proceedings to protect them from infringement after a certain date, makes so important an alteration in the law that it is not surprising to find that the idea of annotating the Act has occurred to more than one author. The two works that head this notice are not the only editions of the new Act, but they are, on the whole, the best that we have yet seen. There is a considerable similarity in what we may call their ground plan. In each there is a statement of the general principles of the law of trade-marks, followed by some discussion of the new Act. Each also contains some practical directions as to the registration of trade-marks; and the bulk of each consists of the reprint of the recent Act and rules of the Merchandise Marks Act, with occasional notes. Mr. Wood, however, has introduced into his book a novel feature in the shape of a list of the majority of trade-mark cases, constructed, in the words of the author, on this plan:—"Opposite the name of each case are placed in one column the references to the reports in which the case appears, and in a separate column such short index of its contents as could be comprised in a few catchwords or a short sentence." In their statement of the general principles of trade-mark law both Mr. Wood and Mr. Daniel appear to be accurate as far as they go, but they do not tell the reader much that he has not been told before. Neither author has much to say in the shape of notes to the Merchandise Marks Act, notwithstanding that it has been fourteen years in operation. With regard to the Act of last session, it will be remembered that it is but a mere skeleton in itself. The Act itself contains but eleven sections, whereas the rules are sixty-five in number. Both Mr. Wood and Mr. Daniel give the Act and rules separately, whereas it is at least questionable whether it would not have been more convenient if they had pieced the Act and rules together, so as to make them read as a whole, so saving the necessity for a great many cross-references.

Notes.

IN A CASE OF *Re Dale*, decided by the Chief Judge on the 19th inst., a question arose as to the right of a person, against whom a bankruptcy petition had been presented, to be heard in opposition to the making of an adjudication, when, through inadvertence, his solicitor had omitted to give the three days' notice required by r. 36 of 1870. The 8th section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, provides that, at the hearing of a bankruptcy petition, the court shall require proof of the debt of the petitioning creditor, and of the trading, if necessary, and of the act of bankruptcy, and, if satisfied with such proof, shall adjudge the debtor to be bankrupt. But the court may adjourn the petition, either conditionally or unconditionally, for the procurement of further evidence, or for any other just cause. R. 36 provides that "where a debtor intends to show cause against a petition he shall file a notice with the registrar, showing the statements in the petition which he intends to deny or dispute, and transmit by post to the petitioning creditor a copy of the notice three days before the day on which the petition is to be heard." And by r. 37, "If the debtor does not appear at the hearing, the court may make adjudication without further proof of the statements in the petition, if it shall think fit." And, by r. 38, "On the appearance of the debtor to show cause against the petition, the petitioning creditor's debt, trading, and act of bankruptcy, or such of those matters as the debtor shall have given notice that he intends to dispute, shall again be proved, and if any new evidence of those matters, or any of them, shall be given, or any witness or witnesses to such matter shall not be present for cross-examination, and further time shall be desired to show cause, the court shall, if it think the application reasonable, grant such further time as it may think fit." In *Re Dale* the debtor alleged that the petitioning creditor's debt had been contracted fraudulently, and he instructed his solicitor to attend at the hearing and resist the petition on this ground. The solicitor inadvertently omitted to give the notice required by r. 36, but he attended at the time fixed for the hearing of the petition, and asked to be allowed to dispute the validity of the petitioning creditor's debt. The registrar refused to allow this, and declined to adjourn the hearing of the petition on any terms. The Chief Judge held that the debtor's evidence ought to have been heard, and that the adjudication could not be supported. But he said that the appellant must pay the costs occasioned through the inadvertence.

ON THE SAME DAY, in a case of *Re Burnett*, a question arose as to what costs ought to be allowed to a petitioning creditor as part of the costs of his petition. R. 31 provides that "The petitioning creditor shall, at his own costs, file and prosecute his petition and the proceedings under any order of adjudication made thereon, until the appointment of a creditors' trustee; and the court shall make order for the payment of such costs out of the first net proceeds of the estate of the bankrupt." And by r. 186, "The court may in all matters before it award such costs as to it shall seem fit and just." By r. 291, "In cases of liquidation by arrangement all proper costs of, and incidental to, the proceedings prior to the passing of the resolution shall be paid by the trustee out of the estate of the debtor, in like manner and in the like priority as the costs of a petitioning creditor under a bankruptcy petition." And by r. 292, "Where bankruptcy occurs pending proceedings for or towards liquidation by arrangement, or composition with creditors, the proper costs incurred in relation to such proceedings shall be paid by the trustee under the bankruptcy out of the debtor's estate, unless the court shall otherwise order." With regard to the last rule it was held in *Re Hawes* (22 W. R. 287, L. R. 9 Ch. 144) that, though the creditors had refused to agree to a liquidation or a composition, yet, as a receiver, who had been appointed under the liquidation petition, had not been discharged when the debtor was adjudged a bankrupt, the proceedings under the petition were still pending at that time, and the trustee under the bankruptcy must pay the costs of the liquidation proceedings out of the bankrupt's estate. In *Re Burnett* a bankruptcy petition

was presented on the 21st of February. The act of bankruptcy alleged was the non-compliance with a debtor's summons, which the debtor had unsuccessfully applied to have dismissed. On the 2nd of March the debtor filed a liquidation petition. On the 7th of March the bankruptcy petition came on to be heard, and an order was made adjourning the hearing until the 24th of March, and it was further ordered that the petitioner's costs of the petition, and of that sitting, should be a first charge on the debtor's estate, as if he had that day been adjudicated a bankrupt. On two subsequent occasions the hearing was again adjourned to await the result of the proceedings under the liquidation petition. Ultimately, the creditors resolved upon a liquidation by arrangement, and the bankruptcy petition was then dismissed. Upon the taxation of the petitioning creditor's costs the registrar refused to allow him the costs of the debtor's summons and the proceedings thereupon, or the costs of the adjournments of the hearing of the bankruptcy petition subsequent to the first, but allowed him only the costs strictly of the petition and of the first sitting for its hearing. The Chief Judge held that the petitioner was entitled to receive out of the debtor's estate all the costs which had been disallowed.

THE 23RD SECTION of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, enables the trustee of a bankrupt to disclaim any property of the bankrupt of an onerous nature, such as land of any tenure burdened with onerous covenants, unmarketable shares in companies, or unprofitable contracts, notwithstanding that the trustee has endeavoured to sell, or has taken possession of, such property, or exercised any act of ownership in relation thereto, and upon the execution of the disclaimer the property disclaimed is, if the same is a contract, to be deemed to be determined from the date of the order of adjudication. Any person injured by the operation of the section is to be entitled to prove as a creditor in the bankruptcy to the extent of such injury. But, by section 24, the trustee is not to be entitled to disclaim any property when he has been called upon in writing by any person interested in the property to decide whether he will disclaim or not, and has for twenty-eight days neglected to give notice whether he disclaims the same or not. In a case of *Re Smeaton*, heard by the Chief Judge on the 19th inst., a question arose as to the liability of a trustee with regard to a contract of the bankrupt as to which he had been called upon to exercise his option of disclaimer, but had not disclaimed. Does the trustee in such a case become personally liable upon the contract? In *Re Smeaton* the debtor, who was a builder of railway wagons, had entered into a contract with the proprietors of a colliery to repair and keep in order for them a number of railway wagons for a term of years, at a fixed annual payment per wagon. After the commencement of the liquidation the trustee was called upon, under section 23, to determine whether he would disclaim the contract or not. He did not disclaim it, but continued to perform it for two years. He then gave the colliery owners notice that he should cease to perform it any longer. Thereupon they commenced an action in one of the common law divisions against the trustee for damages for the breach of the contract, and an order was made in the county court restraining further prosecution of this action. The Chief Judge held that this injunction had been rightly granted. He was of opinion that the trustee had incurred no personal liability upon the contract, and that the only remedy of the other party lay in damages against the debtor's estate. His lordship also intimated an opinion that section 23 had no application to a continuing contract of this nature.

IT WAS SETTLED many years ago that property held by a bankrupt as a trustee is excluded from the operation of the reputed ownership clause, and the same exception was extended to goods in the hands of a factor or agent: *Copeman v. Gallant*, 1 P. W. 314; *Mace v. Cadell*, Cowp. 233; *Ex parte Moldant*, 3 D. & C. 351. The latter case shows that the exception does not depend upon the notoriety of the circumstance that the bankrupt is acting as a factor and holds goods in that character. In a case of *Re Farness*, heard by the Chief Judge on the 19th inst., a person

named Stephenson, who had for many years carried on the trade of a timber merchant in his own name, entered in 1874 into an agreement to carry on the business thenceforth merely as agent for a firm of Fawcus & Craggs, who were to be solely entitled to it, though it was still to be carried on as a distinct business in Stephenson's name. After this agreement was made the business was carried on just as it had been before, in the name of Stephenson. He continued to act as the apparent absolute owner of the timber in his possession, and there was nothing to give any indication to the outside world of the change which had taken place. Ultimately, both Fawcus & Craggs and Stephenson filed liquidation petitions, and Stephenson's trustee claimed on behalf of his creditors to be entitled to the timber belonging to Fawcus & Craggs which was at the commencement of Stephenson's liquidation in his possession. The Chief Judge held that, notwithstanding the recognized exception in favour of factors, the reputed ownership clause applied, and that Fawcus & Craggs could not, by setting up in this way an imaginary firm, be permitted to deprive Stephenson's creditors of their just rights.

Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the meeting of this society on Tuesday last, at the Law Institution (president, Mr. Eady), the society was engaged in settling in committee, proposed rules settling forth the practice during debates, and they were not concluded when the meeting terminated at ten o'clock. Thirty-five members were present. The secretary announced that at the April examination at the Law Institution, Mr. Garrett, a member of the society, was awarded a prize of the Incorporated Law Society.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held at Clement's-inn Hall on Wednesday, June 21, Mr. Rubinstein in the chair. Mr. A. Newman opened the subject for debate, viz.—“That members of the legal profession should alone be eligible to hold the office of coroner, and such officer should be appointed at a paid salary by the Lord Chancellor.” Mr. Edward Hamilton Parnell, solicitor, opposed. Many gentlemen addressed the society, and ultimately the motion was carried by a majority of five votes.

BIRMINGHAM LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

At a meeting of this society held on Tuesday last, S. Balden, jun., Esq., in the chair, the following moot point was discussed:—“A testator devises an estate to persons as trustees, but without declaring any trusts, by his will, and he informs the devisees by parol that his intention in making the devise is that they shall hold the estate in trust for certain persons, which they agree to do. Will the court compel the devisees to execute the parol intention?” Mr. T. A. Garland opened the debate in the affirmative, and was followed by Messrs. Pugh and Edwards. Mr. Whitehouse replied in the negative, and was supported by Messrs. Cresswell, Hadley, and Collins. The question was decided in the negative. A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the meeting.

SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

The sixteenth annual dinner of this Association was held on Wednesday evening last at the Albion Tavern, Aldersgate-street, under the presidency of Lord Geo. Francis Hamilton, M.P. Amongst the company were Joseph Dodds, M.P.; William Gordon, M.P.; Fredk. H. Janson (chairman of the board); J. B. Monckton, town clerk; Edward F. Burton and J. S. Torr, London; H. S. Wasbrough, Bristol; F. T. Velez, Chelmsford (and friend); H. S. Styan, London; W. F. Blandy, Reading; W. E. Shirley, Doncaster; S. Asker, Norwich; H. Briggs, Isleworth; H. J. Torr and T. V. Roberts, London; F. W. Stone, Tunbridge Wells; T. Forster and J. Gibson Youll,

Newcastle-upon-Tyne; J. H. Taylor, Twickenham; Wm. Greaves, A. Drew, H. Sowton (and friend), and G. W. Barnard, London; E. B. Osborn, London; L. Emanuel and A. W. Sadgrove, London; W. Drummond and H. Drummond, Croydon; F. H. Hallett, Ashford; John Laker, Maidstone; G. Beattie, and F. S. Irving, London; W. J. Cooper, Newbury; A. Mayhew, E. Mote, and W. F. Tindell, London; J. Moody, Derby (and friend); G. R. Dodd, London, and T. Sugar, Esqs., &c., &c.

The dinner was served in very good style, and the arrangements seemed to give general satisfaction.

The CHAIRMAN proposed the usual loyal toasts of the Queen, and the Prince and Princess of Wales and the rest of the Royal Family, which were received with the accustomed enthusiasm.

The CHAIRMAN next proposed “The Army, Navy, and Auxiliary Forces,” in doing which he observed that when lately, in consequence of the outrage at Salonica, it was necessary to send a force to that place, we were able to place there a more powerful fleet than the world had ever seen. He coupled with the toast the name of Captain Coltman, of the Inns of Court Volunteers.

Captain COLTMAN, in responding, said he believed the chief object of the forces on behalf of which he was called upon to speak was to do the same as he was anxious to do in his professional capacity, namely, keep his clients out of trouble, and free from any hostile proceedings.

J. S. TORR, Esq., proposed “The Houses of Parliament.” He said we were not only proud of the Houses of Parliament, but also of the individual members of those bodies. They could not be charged with partiality in this respect, for certainly there was no partiality towards the profession of solicitors. The Legislature did not always treat them with the greatest consideration, but he had no doubt it was animated by the best possible motives, only unfortunately sometimes they overdid it. A change might be effected in future, perhaps by the profession becoming more united under one society which should represent it, and place its views before Parliament, showing the Legislature that solicitors had certain grievances and certain claims which ought not to be overlooked. Another course would be to get more solicitors returned to Parliament, which, no doubt, would be attended to, but he was happy to see two gentlemen present to-night who had attained that honour, and he begged to couple with the toast the name of Joseph Dodds, Esq., member for Stockton.

J. DODDS, Esq., in acknowledging the toast, said he could not say anything more about the House of Lords than was known to every gentleman in the room. It was a House of which every one in the country might well be proud. If ability and genius were not always hereditary, there were many remarkable instances where talent had descended in this way, and besides this the ranks of the peerage were continually recruited by the best men in the State, and from every department in the State. In connection with the legal profession he need only mention the three greatest luminaries of the day—the present Lord Chancellor, Lord Hatherley, and Lord Selborne—three men who would make the reputation of any other assembly, but who merely added lustre to the House of Lords. With regard to the House of Commons, there was certainly no body of men who devoted themselves more assiduously to their duties, or who worked longer hours. Allusion had been made to increasing the number of solicitors in the House, but from his own experience he could only advise his brethren to try and relieve themselves from their professional duties before they undertook those of legislators.

The CHAIRMAN next proposed the toast of the evening—“The Solicitors' Benevolent Association, and may Prosperity attend it.” He should not attempt to go into the details of the association, because, though he had made himself acquainted with the reports of the last year and a half, there must be many gentlemen present who had taken a practical part in the management of the association from the very commencement, and who would, therefore, be able to give far more accurately than he could any details as to its present condition. He would, therefore, content himself by stating as briefly as possible what he conceived to be the object of the society. He could not do this better than by quoting two paragraphs from the little epitome which had been circulated; having done so, he said it appeared that the objects were twofold, first to relieve the necessities

of the widows and families of those who had been subscribers, and then, if the funds permitted, they gave assistance also to the families of solicitors who were not members of the association. In other words, the object of the association was to afford benefits to the whole of one great branch of the legal profession—those who had subscribed, of course, having the primary claim. The question might be asked whether the profession really needed such assistance, and he felt some diffidence in speaking on this point, because, though he had the pleasure of numbering amongst his friends many solicitors, not being of a very pugnacious or litigious disposition, he had not much knowledge of the way in which they conducted their business. He could, however, draw a general inference from what appeared to be the general state of the labour market. It was said that the nation was very prosperous, and it was certain that the price of all the necessities of life had become greatly enhanced, while the wages of manual labour had been higher during the last two years than ever before. On the other hand the price of head-work had not risen in a corresponding ratio, and he constantly had applications from gentlemen of good education imploring him to do something for them. It appeared, in fact, very difficult for a gentleman of education, unless he had interest or influence, to obtain adequate employment. If this applied generally, unquestionably it applied to the legal profession, especially if he might draw a deduction from two sad instances of distress, which had been recently mentioned in the papers, in which members of the bar had been found to be in a state of total destitution. These two cases created such an impression that he believed an association, not dissimilar to the present, was established to meet such emergencies, and as it could not be doubted that similar cases might occur amongst solicitors, he was obliged to come to the conclusion that this association was an absolute necessity. There were one or two facts in the report which he could not but notice, the first being the comparatively small proportion of the profession who belonged to the association. He understood that a large number of gentlemen present came from the country, and he would venture to suggest that they could not do better service than by inducing their brethren in their respective neighbourhoods to join the society. He would conclude by reminding them that when they were asked to drink the health of the association they were not expected to confine their efforts on its behalf merely to emptying a glass of wine, but to co-operate as far as their ability went with the committee in extending the usefulness of an association which had done so much good work in the past, and which he hoped would be able in the future still farther to extend the area of its operations.

W. GORDON, Esq., M.P., next proposed the health of the directors of the association and the stewards of the festival. He said they were all met together as members of one profession of which they had a right to be proud; recognizing that they were all working-men, though they might work with their brains rather than with their hands; and that they might at any time be reduced by the vicissitudes of fortune to the position of those who were destitute. It was the recognition of this fact which brought them together, knowing as they did that the association did a vast amount of good, but it must also be borne in mind that such an organization could not be carried on without the assistance of a number of gentlemen who were willing to give time and trouble to its practical affairs, and he therefore felt that they were very much indebted to the directors for the work they had done during the past year.

E. F. BURTON, Esq., in responding, desired in the first place to congratulate his brother stewards on the success which had attended their choice of a chairman, especially as they had on this occasion for the first time departed from the traditional usage, and sought a president outside the ranks of the legal profession. It would be mere affectation to deny that the duties devolving upon the directors were both anxious and responsible, and, having had the honour of being on the board of direction from a very early period, he could recollect the time when there was much more labour than pleasure attending the dispensing of the funds, when at the monthly meetings there was not more than £10 to distribute whilst the claims were as urgent and deserving as at present. Now, he was happy to say the income had risen to £1,300 or £1,400 a year, and they were able to deal satisfactorily with the claims which came upon them. There was one point

which he might specially refer to in reference to an observation that had fallen from the chairman. He did not wonder at his having taken literally one paragraph in the epitome of objects, and supposed that it was only under certain circumstances that the widows or families of non-members were relieved; and there had in fact been a time when they were obliged to draw a line between members and non-members, but that, he was happy to say, was now past. He had always looked upon the society as a charitable and benevolent one, and the cases which came before them were now dealt with indiscriminately, without reference to the question whether the head of the family had been a subscriber or not, but simply upon the merits of each particular case. Much good had been done, but still he was bound to say that much still remained to be done, and the society as yet did not include amongst its members more than twenty-five per cent. of the profession. This state of things ought not to continue, especially considering that they looked for support almost exclusively to the members of their own profession, being in this respect unlike the Clergy Corporation and other benevolent societies. The public were generally disposed to give them credit for a large amount of adhesiveness, and he hoped that this would be shown by a larger recognition of the claims of the society.

F. H. JANSON, Esq., proposed the health of the chairman, which was drunk with great enthusiasm.

The CHAIRMAN, in reply, said he felt that a great honour had been conferred upon him in asking him to preside on this occasion seeing he was the first chairman who did not belong to the legal profession. He was very glad to hear from the secretary that the meeting had been successful, the amount of donations and subscriptions reaching nearly £500, and including eighteen life members and fifty-four annual subscribers. He could not help thinking that if a similar accession to their ranks was made every year the association would continue to flourish and prosper, and if such a good practical result were obtained every year he was sure every chairman would go home with as much satisfaction as he should on that occasion.

J. B. MONCKTON, Esq., town clerk of London, said he was sure he would be excused proposing one more toast, which the modesty of Mr. Eiffe, the secretary, had prevented him from including in the list. They knew that, however perfect the machinery of an engine might be, unless the engineer were of good skill the whole affair might come to grief. As long as he had had to do with the Solicitors' Benevolent Association, which was now a good many years, Mr. Eiffe had been a most excellent secretary, and he was sure they would all feel it would be unbecoming in them to separate without drinking the health of their friend Mr. Eiffe.

Mr. EIFFE said he felt much honoured by the kind way in which Mr. Monckton had spoken of him, and if he had secured the approval of the members he was amply rewarded for what little trouble he had taken.

During the evening a very excellent selection of music was sung by Miss Agnes Larkcom, Madame Poole, Mr. Jeffreys, Mr. Wadmore, and Mr. Fred Walker, under the direction of Mr. John Davis. Mr. Taylor officiated as toastmaster.

A curious illustration of the working of the alphabetical jury system, laid down by the last Irish Jury Act, occurred on Saturday in the Court of Common Pleas, Dublin. The first three names on the panel were each Michael Murphy, and when the name was called three persons simultaneously answered. It transpired that in a panel of forty-eight names there were nineteen Murphys heading the list and seven Murrays, so that had all attended the jury might have been composed altogether of Murphys.

Mr. Mitchell Henry has given notice, on behalf of the member for Limerick, that, on the motion for going into committee on the Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill, the latter would move—"That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that in any Bill intended to constitute a Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland the rules of procedure should be settled and defined in the Act constituting the court in the same manner and to the same extent as they have been in the Acts constituting the English courts."

Obituary.

SIR THOMAS HENRY.

Sir Thomas Henry, knight, chief magistrate at Bow-street Police-court, died very suddenly at his residence, 23, Hanover-square, on Friday, the 16th inst., at the age of sixty-nine. He had been engaged in the discharge of magisterial duties at Ascot Races during the week, and had been suffering from a severe cold, but on Friday afternoon he became so unwell that he at once returned to town. On his arrival at Hanover-square he appeared so much worse that Dr. Quain was sent for, but before his arrival Sir T. Henry had expired. The deceased was the son of Mr. David Henry, of St. Stephen's-green, Dublin, where he was born in 1807. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he graduated. In Hilary Term, 1829, he was called to the bar at the Middle Temple. He practised on the Northern Circuit and the West Riding of Yorkshire Sessions. In 1840 he was appointed a magistrate at the Lambeth Police-court. Six years later he was transferred to Bow-street, and on the resignation of Mr. T. J. Hall (who died a few weeks ago) he became senior magistrate of the latter court, and in 1864 received the honour of knighthood. Sir T. Henry was unmarried. He was a bench of the Middle Temple and a magistrate for Berkshire. Few magistrates in London were more universally respected. As senior magistrate for the metropolis he had to adjudicate upon many important points, such as questions of extradition, charges of treason, &c., and his knowledge of criminal law was very accurate. He was consulted as to the framing of several extradition treaties, and enjoyed the thorough confidence of successive Home Secretaries. On taking his seat at Bow-street Police-court on Saturday morning, Mr. Flowers said:—It is impossible to commence the ordinary business of the day without some expression of the pain and sorrow with which we have heard of the death of the worthy chief magistrate of the metropolitan police-courts. For a long time, now for thirty-six years, Sir Thomas Henry had been a magistrate in London, and I should think that during the whole of that time no man ever discharged the onerous duties of that office so entirely for the good of the people, and the benefit of all those over whom he had to exercise justice. I cannot very well express myself because, you may see, that the loss to us is more than it will be to the other courts, but I think there will not be a single magistrate on the metropolitan bench who will not feel as he has not felt for some time in his sorrow and regret. But how much more so will that be with us who have had more to do with Sir Thomas Henry than the rest of the magistrates, and whom, as a colleague, it was impossible too highly to value. For myself personally, from the very first moment when I had the honour of being appointed to this court, I have received from him the readiest help; and, however long a man may have practised at the bar, such help is sometimes necessary. Not only was he ever ready to give advice, but it was always good advice that he gave. For twelve years he has been chief magistrate, and he died, so to speak, in the actual discharge of his duty. He was a man who never avoided work, and was always ready at all times to do his duty; and he died at, perhaps, the happiest moment a man can die—when in the full discharge of his duties. I know not how it may be with others, but for myself I can say that I should be glad to follow in such steps as his, however far off; for, however we may wish to discharge our duties it is not given to every man to discharge them as Sir Thomas Henry did. I perhaps have inefficiently said what I should say on such an occasion, but I cannot very well express myself to-day—perhaps I can hardly realize the fact that Sir Thomas Henry is no longer a living man. I can only say in conclusion that Sir Thomas Henry owed his country his best services, and, what is better, he paid the debt to the full. Mr. Montagu Williams and Mr. Straight, on behalf of the bar, and Mr. Abrams and Mr. Blanchard Wontner, on behalf of the solicitors, expressed their concurrence in what Mr. Flowers had said, and spoke of the kindness and courtesy which Sir T. Henry always displayed towards the members of the profession. The sad occurrence was alluded to by the magistrates at most of the other metropolitan courts.

MR. HENRY WARWICK COLE, Q.C.

Mr. Henry Warwick Cole, Q.C., judge of county courts, died at his residence, 23, High-street, Warwick, on Monday last (June 19), after a short illness, at the age of sixty-three. Mr. Cole was born in 1813, and was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1836. He practised for many years as an equity draftsman and conveyancer, and was the author of a treatise on "The Law of Domicile of Englishmen in France." In 1861 he obtained a silk gown, and he practised in the court of Vice-Chancellors Kindersley and Malins till 1872, when he was appointed by Lord Hatherley to succeed the late Mr. Welford as judge of county courts for Circuit No. 21, comprising Birmingham, Atherstone, and Tamworth. He discharged his judicial duties with courtesy and patience. He was always prepared to co-operate in all matters of local interest, and had only recently accepted the office of president of the Birmingham Law Students' Society. He was a man of literary taste and attainments (having contributed articles to the *Quarterly Review*, *Fraser's Magazine*, &c.), and was very popular among a large circle of private friends. Mr. Cole's death was unexpected; about a fortnight ago he was suffering from obstruction of the bowels, and had deputed Mr. Kynnersley, the stipendiary magistrate at Birmingham, to take his place. He appeared to be recovering, but unfavourable symptoms presented themselves, and he sank very rapidly.

Appointments, &c.

Mr. ADAM GIB ELLIS, advocate, has been appointed a Pains Judge for the Colony of Mauritius, in succession to Mr. Justice Gorrie, who has been appointed Chief Justice of Fiji. Mr. Ellis was called to the Scotch bar in 1866; and has been Substitute-Procureur for the Mauritius since 1871.

Mr. EDWARD LOUGHLIN O'MALLEY, barrister, has been appointed Attorney-General for the Colony of Jamaica, in the place of Mr. George Harley Barne, deceased. Mr. O'Malley is the eldest son of the late Mr. Peter Frederick O'Malley, Q.C., Recorder of Norwich. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated as a senior optime in 1864. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Hilary Term, 1866, and was a member of the old Norfolk Circuit. He unsuccessfully contested the borough of Bedford in the Conservative interest in 1868. He is a revising barrister, and is the author (jointly with Mr. Henry Hardcastle) of several volumes of election-petition reports.

Mr. HORATIO HALE SHEPARD, barrister, has been appointed to officiate as Reporter in the Madras High Court for the Indian Law Reports. Mr. Shepard was educated at Balliol College, Oxford, where he graduated second class in classics in 1865, and he was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1867. He formerly practised on the Home Circuit, and was one of the staff of the *Weekly Reporter*. Mr. Shepard is Government Pleader for the Madras Presidency, and is author (jointly with Mr. Cunningham, Advocate-General of Madras) of "Commentaries on the Indian Contract Act."

Mr. ALLAN FREDERICK TURNER, solicitor (of the firm of Chalk & Turner), of Bombay, has been appointed Deputy-Coroner for the Town of Bombay.

It is stated that effect will shortly be given to the report which was prepared last autumn by the Master of the Rolls and Mr. Lingen, of the Treasury, upon the Patent Office. The *Pall Mall Gazette* understands that, while recommending a small addition to the salaries of some of the senior clerks, the authorities are of opinion that the staff appointments, which are about twelve in number, should not be filled up upon their next becoming vacant. Moreover, with a view to carry out the view which the report expresses, that the Patent Office cannot for the future be considered as a scientific, or even a quasi-scientific, department, it is proposed to recruit the clerical staff as occasion may arise from time to time hereafter from clerks of the new "second grade" only, who attain to a maximum salary of £200 per annum after twenty-five years' service.

Legal News.

At the Manchester County Police-court, on Wednesday, an application was made for an order of ejectment on behalf of Mr. G. T. Peate against Mr. R. D. Miller, banker, King-street, who occupies a cottage at Cadishead. Mr. Rylance, who appeared for Mr. Miller, took a preliminary objection to the proceeding that the statute had not been complied with, inasmuch as the notice of intention to apply to justices was not read over to the person on whom it was served at the time of service. Mr. Wilson, for the plaintiff, submitted that the objection was idle, the provision of the statute no doubt being intended as a protection to poor and illiterate persons, and not to apply to persons occupying the responsible position of Mr. Miller, and he hoped that the Bench would not favour the objection. Sir J. I. Mantell said he considered the statute imperative, and should be obliged to dismiss the application, which was done accordingly.

A novel application of the art of photography, says the *Albany Law Journal*, was made in a cause on trial before Mr. Justice Dykman, in the Supreme Court Circuit, New York. The question at issue was, whether the certification of a cheque, purporting to have been made by the teller of the bank on which it was drawn, was genuine or a forgery. The teller swore that it was not his certificate, and several experts pronounced the signature a forgery; while other experts called by the holder of the cheque were equally positive that the signature was genuine. Thereupon the court-room was darkened, and "Prof. Combe," with the aid of a magic lantern, threw an image, from a photographic negative, of the cheque in question, upon the wall, to show that the writing was free and flowing and not the laboured and re-touched signature which is the usual accompaniment of forgeries, and which some of the experts insisted appeared in this case. This exhibition seems to have had the desired effect, as the jury found that the signature was genuine.

A parliamentary return respecting the prisons of Great Britain shows that the daily average number of prisoners in custody in the prisons of England and Wales is 18,130. The "average annual cost per prisoner, without allowing for earnings of labour," ranges in the various prisons from £113 5s. (in Lincoln county prison) to £6 6s. 8d. (in Montgomery county prison), and the total of this column in the return is stated, not very intelligibly, to be £4,363. The "average annual net profit of each prisoner's labour" ranges from £49 13s. 6d. (in Nottingham county prison) to 1s. (in Portsmouth borough prison and Bury St. Edmunds county prison). The return gives the "total" as £425 14s. 3d. The "average annual cost per prisoner, after deducting net profit on prison labour," ranges from £113 1s. 4d. (in Lincoln county prison) to £1 6s. 4d. (in Nottingham county prison). The "total" of this column is given as £3,937 5s. 9d. The return also gives for each prison the proportion of re-committals to the total number committed. In Scotland the daily average number of prisoners is 2,851. The annual cost per prisoner, on the whole of the prisons, is £24 15s. 8d.; the average profit per prisoner for work sold, £2 8s. 6d.; and the average loss per prisoner on work, 2d.

"A. & Co." write to the *Times*:—"As the Appellate Jurisdiction of the House of Lords is now under discussion, will you permit us to narrate the following story? In February last we obtained a judgment of the House of Lords, dismissing with costs an appeal in which we were respondents. The costs were shortly afterwards taxed at about £700. The appellant declined to pay. Our solicitors then informed us that nobody knew how the decree could be enforced, and that there was no modern instance of such a thing being done. There were "recognisances," but it was difficult to get them "estreated," and they were wholly insufficient in amount. There was the Sergeant-at-Arms, but, even if ultimately moved, he was a man of many fees and few terrors. No execution could be issued, and the appellant's property could not be touched. We were at first incredulous, but after our solicitors, their agents, and counsel have been three months at work, we are now gravely presented with the written opinion of counsel that it will be wiser

to discontinue the attempt to work the House of Lords' machinery, and to try whether or not another court may help us by treating the £700 due to us as a debt on which to ground a petition in bankruptcy (which we are told is "doubtful").

The *Dublin Evening Mail* says that Mr. Justice Barry had to send out bailiffs into the streets and lanes on Monday to drive in a sufficient number of jurors to fill a box, and, the raid failing, was obliged to borrow four jurors from a neighbouring court in order to make up his number. The other court—the First Queen's Bench—was able to lend only through the complacency of certain parties to an action who agreed to intrust the decision of the dispute to eight jurors. Out of six persons sent for by Barry, J., five turned out to be non-existent: some were dead, some were not known ever to have lived, although they were all summoned by the proper officer. The sixth had to put up his shutters and close his shop for the day in order to be at liberty to serve his country in the jury-box. A ray of light was thrown upon this state of affairs by certain remarks which fell from Chief Justice Morris in the Court of Common Pleas. The case before the court was a trumpety one of assault and trespass, in a quarrel about a pew in a chapel, which the jury properly disposed of by disagreeing, so as to give no triumph to either party. It is with cases of this description, Chief Justice Morris said, brought from distant localities, that Dublin juries are employed and worried. "Of all the issues prepared for their determination not one came from anywhere near their own city."

A deputation from Exeter, Devon, Tiverton, Barnstaple, and Axminster on Saturday waited upon the Home Secretary, at the Home Office, to ask him to refuse his sanction to the proposed removal of the Assize Court of Exeter to Plymouth. Among those present were Sir Stafford Northcote, M.P., the Mayor of Exeter, Lord Fortescue, Sir J. K. Kennaway, Bart., M.P., Sir J. K. Amory, Bart., M.P., Mr. T. Cave, M.P., Mr. S. D. Waddy, M.P., Mr. C. J. Murch, Sir H. Peek, Bart., and Mr. Arthur Mills, M.P. Mr. Arthur Mills, M.P., introduced them, and in doing so presented several memorials from different towns and places within a radius of twenty miles from Exeter, with reference to an apprehended removal of the assizes from Exeter to Plymouth, and expressing in them the opinion of the memorialists that any such removal would injuriously affect the interests of Exeter in the conduct of its legal business, as the chief assize town of Devon, and they urged that Exeter, owing to its central position, was infinitely better suited as a place for holding the assizes than Plymouth. He stated that the gross population of the county of Devon was about half a million, about one-quarter of whom would prefer the assizes being held at Plymouth, while the other three-quarters gave a preference for their continuing at Exeter. Lord Fortescue stated that the railway accommodation from the different extremities of the county of Devon made it very necessary indeed that the assizes should be retained in their present position. The Mayor of Exeter said that their objections to the removal of the assizes were that they had been held at Exeter from time immemorial, and also stated that the city was in direct communication with the whole of the county. Sir Stafford Northcote, M.P., said he had been asked to take part in the deputation for various reasons, among others because he happened to be President of the Exeter Chamber of Commerce, and he was desired to present a memorial of that Association, urging their objections to the proposal for the removal of the assizes, which they were surprised had been made. Sir John Amory, Mr. Cave, M.P., and other gentlemen having spoken to a like effect, the Home Secretary, in reply, said that he had received a memorial from Plymouth, asking that the assizes might be taken to that town; and that, before acting on such a petition, he had taken the precaution to send it down to the place from which it emanated, in order to find what public opinion was in regard to it. The whole question was one of public convenience, and people who wanted to remove the assizes must make out a strong case before their wishes could be complied with.

Legislation of the Week.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

June 16.—**ECCLESIASTICAL OFFICES AND FEES.**

The House went into committee on this Bill, and the various clauses were agreed to after some amendments.—The Bill, as amended, was subsequently reported to the House.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON).

This Bill was read a second time.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (HALSHAM, &c.).

This Bill was read a second time.

June 19.—**TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (BRISTOL, &c.).**

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

June 20.—**VIVISECTION.**

Their lordships went into committee on this Bill. Clauses 1 and 2 were agreed to.

On clause 3, providing general restrictions as to the performance of painful experiments on animals, Lord RAYLEIGH and Lord CARDWELL proposed as amendments on the clause to strike out the words restricting vivisection to experiments for the saving or prolonging human life or alleviating human suffering, and insert words permitting of vivisection for the advancement of medical or physiological knowledge.—Lord Cardwell's amendment was agreed to, and the clause was ordered to stand part of the Bill.

On clause 4, which provides that "the substance known as urari or curare shall not, for the purposes of the Act, be deemed to be an anæsthetic," Lord HENNIKER proposed an amendment which would make the clause read that the substance should not be used on any wounded animal.—The amendment was withdrawn and the clause was agreed to.

On clause 5, the Earl of HARROWBY moved, in page 3, line 8, after "cat," to insert "or horse, or ass, or mule."—The amendment was agreed to.—The Duke of ABERYLL moved, in page 3, line 8, to add, "but nothing in this section shall prevent a person holding a licence under this Act from administering to a dog or cat drugs or medicines with a view to ascertain their effect in the cure or treatment of disease, or with a view to the detection of crime."—The Earl of CARNARVON proposed to amend the clause by inserting after the word "cat" the following words:—"Except on such certificate being given as in this Act mentioned, and that for reasons specified in such certificate and where the object of the experiment would be necessarily frustrated unless it is made on an animal similar in constitution to a dog or a cat, and no other animal is available for the experiment," but it was agreed to defer the question till the report.—The clause was then agreed to, as were also clauses 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10.

On clause 11, which sets forth the names of the scientific bodies who may give certificates for the making of experiments, the Earl of CARNARVON proposed to add the Presidents of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, the Royal Irish Academy, the General Medical Council, and the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow.—The motion was agreed to.—On the motion of the Earl of CARNARVON, in page 4, line 22, after "anatomy" the words "medical jurisprudence, materia medica" were inserted.—The Duke of SOMERSET moved, page 4, line 27, after "charter," to add "or a duly recognized medical school."—The amendment was withdrawn, and clause 11 was added to the Bill.

The remaining clauses were then agreed to.

TRADE-MARKS REGISTRATION AMENDMENT.

This Bill was read a second time.

INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES.

This Bill was read a second time.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (HORNSEY).

This Bill was read a second time.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (TOLLESHUNT MAJOR).

This Bill was read a second time.

PROVISIONAL ORDERS (IRELAND) CONFIRMATION (COLERAINE, &c.).

This Bill was read a second time.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARDS PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (BIRMINGHAM, &c.).

This Bill was read a second time.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARDS PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (CHELMSFORD, &c.).

This Bill was read a second time.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARDS PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (CARNARVON, &c.).

This Bill was read a second time.

SMITHFIELD PRISON (DUBLIN).

This Bill was read a second time.

KINGSTOWN HARBOUR.

This Bill was read a second time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

June 16.—**QUEENBOROUGH HARBOUR.**

This Bill was read a third time.

ARMY CORPS TRAINING.

This Bill, as amended, was considered.

Mr. HARDY moved a new clause providing for the appointment of special commissioners by the Lords Lieutenant of the counties of Surrey, Sussex, Hants, Wilts, Gloucester, and Somerset, one for each county.—The clause was read a second time.

Several amendments proposed by Mr. HARDY were agreed to.

POOR LAW RATING (IRELAND).

This Bill was read a second time.

PREVENTION OF CRIMES ACT AMENDMENT.

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

ALL SAINTS, MOSS.

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

STATUTE LAW REVISION (SUBSTITUTED ENACTMENTS).

This Bill passed through committee.

June 19.—**ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.**

This Bill was read a second time, on a division, by 356 to 78.

ARMY CORPS TRAINING.

This Bill was read a third time.

STATUTE LAW REVISION (SUBSTITUTED ENACTMENTS).

This Bill was read a third time.

TOLLS ON BRIDGES (RIVER THAMES).

This Bill was read a second time, and referred to a select committee.

DUBLIN.

Mr. SULLIVAN introduced a Bill for the better government of the city of Dublin, and for the enlargement of the municipal boundaries thereof.

June 20.—**COMMONS.**

On consideration of this Bill as amended, Sir C. DILKE moved, after clause 14, to insert the following new clause:—"In any application to grant an injunction against the inclosure of land when it is, upon the hearing of the case, proved that the same is common or commonable, it shall not be necessary that the applicant should have rights of common in the same."—On a division the clause was rejected by 178 to 91.

Mr. BRISTOWE moved to insert, after clause 14, a clause to the effect that a person making an illegal inclosure should forfeit a sum of £100 to any one who might sue for the same, provided the action were brought within one year from the date of the inclosure.—On a division the clause was rejected by 188 to 95.

Mr. SANDFORD proposed the insertion of a clause, after clause 13, requiring persons who intended to "approve or inclose" to give six months' notice to the Inclosure Commissioners, and empowering the latter, should they think fit, to oppose the proceeding "out of any moneys in their hands applicable to their general expenses."—On a division the clause was rejected by 189 to 155.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE moved the insertion of a clause to the effect that the provisions of the Inclosure Acts, 1845 to 1868, which authorized the Inclosure Commissioners to require allotments for exercise and recreation and allotments for field gardens for the labouring poor to be made upon any inclosure of a common which was waste of a manor, or subject to unrestricted rights of common, should extend to authorize them to require such allotments to be made upon any inclosure of common which was not waste of a manor or subjected to unrestricted rights of common.—The clause was agreed to.

Mr. WHEELHOUSE moved a clause prohibiting surveyors of highways, highway boards, and trustees of turnpike roads from digging gravel, &c., on commons without the consent of the persons having the management of the same.—The clause was agreed to.

Lord E. FITZMAURICE moved a clause providing that field gardens should be free of rent-charge.—The clause was agreed to.

Lord E. FITZMAURICE moved another clause vesting allotments for recreation grounds in the churchwardens and overseers of the parish.—The clause was agreed to.

Lord H. SCOTT moved a clause to the effect that six months' notice of every claim to inclose should be given in the *London Gazette*, and in two or more of the principal local newspapers.—The clause was amended and agreed to.

Mr. COWPER-TEMPLE proposed a proviso to clause 8, which would apply to provincial towns, and would, he thought, harmonize with the spirit and scope of the Bill:—"Provided, that the Inclosure Commissioners shall not entertain an application for the inclosure of a common or a part of a common which is situated in or within one mile of any town comprising a population which exceeds 5,000; or in or within two miles of any town comprising a population which exceeds 10,000; or in or within three miles of any town comprising a population which exceeds 20,000; or in or within four miles of any town comprising a population which exceeds 50,000; or in or within five miles of any town comprising a population which exceeds 100,000; or in or within six miles of any town comprising a population which exceeds 200,000. When part only of any common subject to be inclosed is situated within the aforesaid distance from a town, such part shall be deemed for the purposes of this Act to be a distinct common from the part which is not situated within the aforesaid distance from the town."—The amendment was rejected on a division by 223 to 131.

Mr. FAWCETT moved in clause 12, after sub-section 7, the insertion of words providing in effect that the public opinion of the neighbourhood should be appealed to, not only when an inclosure was first contemplated, but also when it was ascertained whether the inclosure was or was not desired after the commissioners had definitely decided upon what terms and conditions it was proposed that it should be carried out.—The amendment was negatived.

JURORS QUALIFICATION (IRELAND).

The House went into committee on this Bill.

The various clauses were agreed to with amendments.

In schedule 1, page 5, line 6, Mr. DOWNING proposed to leave out £50 and insert £40. He thought the qualification proposed was too high, especially in the county of Cork.—The amendment was withdrawn.

Schedules 2 and 3 were agreed to.

JUNE 21.—LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT (IRELAND) AMENDMENT.

Mr. S. CRAWFORD moved the second reading of this Bill, but the debate stood adjourned.

LOCAL LIGHT DUES (REDUCTION).

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

METROPOLIS GAS (SURREY SIDE).

Sir C. ADDERLEY introduced a Bill to amend the laws regulating the supply of gas by the Phoenix Gaslight and Coke Company, the London Gaslight Company, and the Surrey Consumers' Gas Company, and to grant further powers to those companies.

ISAAC F. REDFIELD.

(From the "American Law Register.")

As already briefly announced in our last issue, this distinguished jurist died at his residence in Charlestown, Mass., on March 23, 1876. So great a loss to the science of jurisprudence cannot be passed by without some notice, especially in a law journal with which he was so long and so intimately connected, and in which he had made himself no less the friend than the instructor of the entire legal profession of the United States.

Isaac Fletcher Redfield was the oldest of twelve children of Dr. Peleg Redfield, an eminent physician, and was born April 10, 1804, at Weathersfield, Vermont. He graduated at Dartmouth College in the class of 1825, and was admitted to the bar of Vermont in 1827. After practising at Derby for eight years, during the last three of which he was Attorney of the State for Orleans county, he was in 1835, at the early age of thirty-one, elected by the Legislature of Vermont to the bench of the Supreme Court, and held that position by successive annual elections until 1860, when he resigned, or rather declined a re-election. For the last eight years of this period he was Chief Justice of the court. From 1857 to 1861 he was also Professor of Medical Jurisprudence in Dartmouth College, succeeding the Hon. Joel Parker. In 1861 he removed to Massachusetts, where he continued to reside until his death, with the exception of a year or so, in 1867 and 1868, which he spent in England and France, as special counsel for the United States, by appointment from the State Department, to look after the interests of the Government in the property that had belonged to the Confederate States at the close of the war.

These few events mark the outlines of his public life, but they give little indication, except to the instructed, of the steady industry, the activity of mind, and the amount of useful labour accomplished during more than the third of a century.

During all the time that Judge Redfield sat upon the bench, the duties of a judge of the Supreme Court of Vermont were extremely arduous. The court consisted during most of the time of five judges, who held separate circuit courts for jury trials, were *ex-officio* chancellors, and heard and determined many important cases in equity, besides sitting *in Banco* for several months each year for the final decision of all questions of common law and equity, upon writs of error and appeals. During the first few years that Judge Redfield occupied the bench, the judges also, under a statute of the State, reported their own decisions. All of these varied and exacting duties he performed, not only to the satisfaction of his own bar, but to the great reputation of his court and himself throughout the country. His decisions extend from the eighth to the thirty-third volume of Vermont Reports, inclusive, and long before he left the bench they had established for him a national reputation as a wise, learned, and able jurist.

Great and permanent, however, as is his reputation as a judge, it is probable that he was even more widely known to the profession of the present day as a law-writer. Notwithstanding the constant and engrossing labours of his judicial position, Judge Redfield found time, while still on the bench, to write a text-book on the Law of Railways, published in 1857, which at once became the accepted authority as the repository of the American law on that important subject, and, after passing through five editions, remains without a rival at the present day. It is probable that the success of this work, combined with his desire for a more settled and domestic life than was possible under the requirements of circuit duty on the bench, led him, in 1860, to the resolution to resign, and devote himself more exclusively thereafter to the literature of the law. The weight of advancing years he could scarcely have felt. Erect, and active in body as well as mind, he still lacked four years of the age at which the rigid laws of New York had declared Chancellor Kent unfit for longer judicial service, and at fifty-six he, like the great chancellor, was in his prime, and like him, too, he devoted the remaining years of his mature intellect to the instruction of his professional brethren by his pen. In 1864 he published the first volume of an elaborate work on the law of wills, which was subsequently expanded, in successive editions, to three volumes, covering the entire subject. Every lawyer will appreciate the magnitude of such a labour. Few States, except the youngest of the union, fail to afford, by themselves, cases enough on this prolific subject to fill a text-book, and the task of collecting, arranging, and

collating them, and extracting the rules of decision from the vast and incongruous mass, is one that might well appal a less industrious and courageous man. This, like his preceding work, had a marked success, and the author was engaged in the last touches of a new edition at the time of his death. Besides these principal works, Judge Redfield published, in 1869, a treatise on the Law of Carriers and Bailments, which was, however, mainly a condensation, and more convenient form, of the parts of his work on Railways relating to those subjects; in 1870—1872, a collection, in two volumes, of Leading American Railway Cases, with notes; in 1871, in connection with Mr. M. M. Bigelow, a collection of leading American cases, on the Law of Bills of Exchange, Promissory Notes and Cheques, with notes; a volume of Leading American Cases on the Law of Wills, with notes; and also edited, with great care and learning, Greenleaf on Evidence, Story on Agency, on the Conflict of Laws, on Equity Jurisprudence, and on Equity Pleadings.

In 1861 Judge Redfield became one of the editors of the *American Law Register*, and from that time to the present, few numbers have been issued without an article or an annotation by him upon a leading case. Of the extent and importance of these labours our readers do not need to be told. Covering in their range every branch of the law, and every variety of treatment, from a brief pertinent criticism of the case itself up to the most learned and elaborate monograph on the subject suggested by it, they have exhibited the depth and breadth of his learning, the facility of his command of legal principles, the high integrity and fearless independence of his personal character. These qualities, no less than the warmth of his heart, had made him seem a friend to all his readers, whose monthly visits every one will regret to have so unexpectedly terminated.

Among the articles which he has thus furnished to our pages during the last fifteen years were many of great importance, to which he gave much thought and labour. As specimens we may mention those on Street Railways, vol. 1, N. S., 193; Mortgages, vol. 2, p. 1; the Conflict of Laws Affecting Marriage and Divorce, vol. 3, p. 193; the Responsibilities and Duties of Express Carriers, vol. 5, p. 1; Regulations of Inter-State Traffic by Congress, vol. 13, p. 1; the Law applicable to the Negotiation of Contracts by Telegraph, vol. 14, p. 401; and the Right and Power of Eminent Domain in the National Government, in the April number of the present year. These articles he regarded as among his best work; he took pleasure in them and in the fact that in them he was addressing the entire professional audience of the country, who, through these writings, had become his admirers and friends. His last work was the correction of the proofs of the article on Eminent Domain in the April number. Besides this, he had prepared some notes to cases which will yet appear in our pages during the next few months.

His writings were characterized by breadth and liberality of views, by clearness and force as well as originality of opinion, by a conservatism as cautious as it was free from timidity or foginess, and by great learning, not only in case law, but in fundamental legal principles which he handled with the ease that comes from long familiarity. He wrote rapidly, with the facility of a full man. Hence his style was perhaps always a little diffuse and occasionally lacking in grace, but, however hasty, it never degenerated into inaccuracy of thought or even into obscurity of expression.

In this day of the diffusion of education and the multiplication of books, perhaps it can hardly be said, as Coke, paraphrasing Seneca, says of Littleton, that "when a great learned man (who is long in making) dieth, much learning dieth with him." Yet, in a considerable sense, it is true, even now, that a ripe and experienced scholar in the law leaves a gap which can never be quite filled. A certain command of questions, from having grown up with them from their cradle to their maturity, does die with the learned of their own day and generation. The times change, and the questions which command attention in the law change with them. The rules which have prevailed in the contest of yesterday become settled, and to-morrow are accepted upon didactic authority, while the reason which inquires, and disputes, and struggles, goes forward to new battles over problems still unsolved. But the learning which accepts accomplished facts upon authority is never quite as complete, as intimate, as stereoscopic in its view, as that which has watched their growth and knows all their parts

from its own observation. In this sense the learning of each generation dies with it, and in this sense it may be said that upon certain subjects which he had made peculiarly his own the authority of Judge Redfield's opinion cannot be replaced. Notably is this the case upon railroad law. The whole of it had grown up while he was in active life; it was familiar to him from its modest beginnings until it had assumed its present vast proportions, as the heaviest title in American litigation. It was his favourite field in the law, and he grew with it, and kept pace with its constant expansion. It is certainly rather remarkable that, although he was a life-long Democrat, and had received his political education while the strict constructionist school had the unquestioned control of that party, yet he adopted in his latter years what may be called the new school of latitudinarian construction of the constitutional powers of Congress over railroad lines running through more than one State, and indeed over all questions of inter-State traffic. That he not only entertained but advocated these views, is a striking evidence of the honesty of his convictions and the courage of his character.

As already said, Judge Redfield was a Democrat from early life, and the adoption of such opinions at a time and in a place where the Democratic party was in a hopeless minority, required no small degree of courage, as well as sincerity. In this connection, mention must not be omitted of the most remarkable incident of his life, honourable alike to him and to his State, and without a parallel in American judicial history. The Legislature by which he was elected to the Supreme Court of Vermont in 1835 was strongly opposed to him in political opinion, and so continued for the twenty-five years through which, by successive annual elections, he was retained in that position. A greater tribute to qualifications for his position was never paid to any judge in any country.

But though a Democrat he was in no present sense of the term a politician. He was, above all things, a lawyer. Perhaps his most remarkable quality was the warmth and strength of his love of justice. He stood by the law as a general rule of action; he believed in the existence of a science of administrative justice, and recognized clearly that choice of evils which every judge so often encounters between individual hardship and the breaking down of a salutary rule. In such cases he stood firmly upon the ancient ways, but he never yielded to a result which failed to do individual justice, except under compulsion.

THE BANKRUPTCY BILL.

ON the motion that this Bill be read a second time,

LORD HATHERLEY said that there were two grievances connected with the law on bankruptcy—one was that a bankrupt was allowed to be discharged upon payment of a very moderate dividend, or no dividend at all, through the influence of some favoured creditors; and the other was that a bankrupt's property was intrusted to persons unworthy of that trust, who took care to retain for their own benefit a large proportion of the bankrupt's property. As he mentioned on the last occasion, of 2,000 or 3,000 only 200 or 300 had paid any dividend at all. The Act of 1869, therefore, left every initiatory step in bankruptcy to the creditors, and no man could be discharged from his debts until he paid 10s. in the pound, unless the majority in number and three-fourths in value of his creditors passed a resolution at a properly convened meeting to the effect that his inability to pay his debts was the result, not of his own fault, but of unavoidable misfortune. He wished to point out that one clause in the Bill proposed to restore to the bankrupt the power of initiating bankruptcy proceedings in his own behalf for the purpose of putting his affairs in liquidation—a proceeding which he was afraid would revive all the old evils that were so rife before the Act of 1869 was passed. He thought, therefore, that the noble and learned lord would do well to omit that clause from his Bill. With regard to the administration of the assets of the bankrupt, that duty before the Act of 1869 had been intrusted to the officers of the court with very unsatisfactory results, and by that Act it was handed over to the trustee, who was to be chosen by the creditors at a public meeting called for the purpose.

Under such circumstances the creditors had no right to complain if the trustee whom they themselves had chosen acted improperly. The Act of 1869 contained some very severe provisions regulating the conduct of the trustee, under which he was required to account to the officer of the court for his administration of the assets, and was bound to pay all sums over £50 in the aggregate he received in his capacity as trustee into such bank as the creditors should select within a very short time of his receiving them. Under the Bill it was proposed that the provisional committee of inspection should consist of the five creditors resident in England by whom the largest amounts appeared by the debtor's list of creditors to be provable. The objection to that proposal was that the creditors of a bankrupt who had lost largely by his failure were seldom desirous of coming forward, and thus proclaiming that they had incurred bad debts to a considerable amount in the course of their business. The clause which directed that unclaimed or undistributed dividends should vest in the Crown at the expiration of five years, would afford a very efficient check upon those empowered to administer bankrupt estates. He was, on the whole, most anxious that the measure should pass, believing that it would prove a very useful amendment of the present law.

The LORD CHANCELLOR would not repeat the observations he had previously made in introducing this measure, but expressed his obligation to the noble and learned lord for the criticisms he had made upon the Bill, and the suggestions of amendment that he had offered. He might point out that, although the present Bill looked rather formidable in its dimensions, it was in reality mainly a re-enactment of the Act of 1869. He admitted that by proposing to repeal the Act of 1869, and to re-enact the greater part of its provisions in the present measure he ran the risk of extending the surface of opposition, but at the same time, having always advocated the principle of repeal and re-enactment, instead of patchwork legislation, he should not like to shrink from carrying out that principle in the present instance. The noble and learned lord had correctly stated that the object of the Act of 1869 was to transfer the power of initiating proceedings in bankruptcy against himself from the debtor to his creditors, but, unfortunately, that Act allowed the debtor to initiate proceedings in liquidation and composition, and the consequence was that bankruptcy proper as compared with liquidation and composition had become a mere trifle. He had thought it preferable, therefore, to abolish the distinction between those methods of procedure, and to place all proceedings in bankruptcy under proper control, and under a uniform system. It was true that under the Act of 1869 a bankrupt was not entitled to his discharge without the assent of the majority in number and three-fourths in value of his creditors unless he had paid 10s. in the pound, but that provision only applied to bankruptcy proper, and not to liquidation or composition. In conclusion, he expressed approval of the views stated by his noble and learned friend who had recently addressed the House in reference to the appointment of trustees in bankruptcy, and the period within which estates should be wound up when liquidation had been resorted to.

Court Papers.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE. SUMMER ASSIZES.

CROWN OFFICE, June 19.

The following is substituted for that which appeared in the last *Gazette* as the days and places for holding the summer assizes, North-Eastern Circuit:—

NORTH-EASTERN.

(Mr. Justice LUSH and Mr. Justice DENMAN.)

Durham.—Thursday, June 29, at Durham.

Northumberland and County of the Town of Newcastle-upon-Tyne.—Thursday, July 6, at Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

North and East Riding Division of Yorkshire, and County of the City of York.—Saturday, July 15, at York.

West Riding Division.—Saturday, July 22, at Leeds.

[The dates are the same as we gave last week.—E. S. J.]

CHANCERY DIVISION.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	COURT OF APPEAL.	MASTER OF THE ROLLS.	
Monday, June 26	Mr. Clowes	Mr. Latham	
Tuesday 27	Pemberton	Merivale	
Wednesday .. 28	Leach	Latham	
Thursday 29	Pemberton	Merivale	
Friday 30	Clowes	Merivale	
Saturday July 1	Leach	Latham	
V. C. MALINS. V. C. BACON. V. C. HALL.			
Monday, June 26	Mr. Milne	Mr. Teesdale	Mr. Farrer
Tuesday 27	King	Ward	Holdship
Wednesday .. 28	Milne	Teesdale	Farrer
Thursday 29	King	Ward	Holdship
Friday 30	Milne	Teesdale	Farrer
Saturday July 1	King	Ward	Holdship

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

June 23, 1876.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 94½ x d	Annuities, April, '85, 9½
Ditto for Account, July 5, 94½	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1868
Do 3 per Cent. Reduced, 94½	Ex Billa, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 11 pm.
New 3 per Cent., 94½	Ditto, £500, Do, 11 pm.
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £300, 11 pm.
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, — per
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '79	Ct. (last half-year), 251
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	Ditto for Account.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80, 105	Ditto, 5½ per Cent., May, '79, 86
Ditto for Account, —	Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cent.,
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '83, 102½	April, '84
Ditto, ditto, Certificates —	Do. Do, 5 per Cent., Aug. '73
Ditto En-faced Ppr., 4 per Cent. 84	Do. Bonds, 4 per Cent., £1000
2nd Inf. Pr., 5 per Ct., Jan. '73	Ditto, ditto, under £1000

RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	140
Stock Caledonian	100	113½
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	97
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	36½
Stock Great Northern	100	129
Stock Do., A Stock	100	135
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	—
Stock Great Western—Original	100	105½
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	131½
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	160½
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	21
Stock London and North-Western	100	142½
Stock London and South Western	100	124
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	63½
Stock Metropolitan	100	100
Stock Do., District	100	44½
Stock Midland	100	131½
Stock North British	100	92
Stock North Eastern	100	155½
Stock North London	100	129
Stock North Staffordshire	100	62
Stock South Devon	100	65
Stock South-Eastern	100	126

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The weekly return issued yesterday afternoon shows that the Bank now holds nearly 29½ millions of bullion, being the largest total ever recorded, the proportion of reserve to liabilities being 55½ per cent. The foreign market has been quiet, with very little business doing. Home railways are all better, Caledonian showing the principal improvement. Consols close at 94½ to 94½ for money and account.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

BRAMLEY—June 15, at Claremont-crecent, Sheffield, the wife of Herbert Bramley, solicitor, of a daughter.

BUTLER—June 18, at Julian-hill, Harrow, the wife of Spencer Perceval Butler, barrister-at-law of a son.
POLLOCK—June 15, at 12, Bryanston-street, the wife of Frederick Pollock, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.
WEIGHTMAN—June 15, at The Grove, Ailsea-park, Twickenham, the wife of T. T. Weightman, barrister-at-law, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

CLIFFORD-GILMORE—May 31, at San Francisco, California, U.S., George Frederick Clifford, barrister-at-law, of the Middle Temple, to Josephine S., youngest daughter of Mrs. Gilmore, of Llewellyn-park, Orange, New Jersey, and the late Hiram Sanford Gilmore, of Ohio, Cincinnati.
SAUNDERS-SANTY—June 15, at the parish church, Foulsham, James Saunders, solicitor, to Catherine (Kate) Santy, youngest daughter of the late James Santy, of the Old Hall, Ingoldisthorpe.

DEATHS.

BRUCE—June 21, in Down-street, Piccadilly, James Ernest Brudenell Bruce, barrister-at-law, of the Inner Temple, son of the Right Hon. Lord Ernest Bruce, M.P.
DOBIE—June 14, Alexander Dobie, solicitor, of 4, Hyde-park-terrace, Kensington-gore, and 2, Lancaster-place, Strand, aged 81.
LEEMING—June 10, at his residence, 61, Manchester-road, Southport, Thomas Leeming, solicitor, of Manchester, late of Redcliffe House, Barton-on-Irwell, aged 75.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

FRIDAY, June 16, 1876.

Munby, Frederick James, and Louis Henry Symonds, Manchester, Attorneys and Solicitors. June 14

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, June 16, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Anglo-German Tunneling Company, Limited.—The M.R. has, by an order dated May 10, appointed Alfred William Morgan, Throgmorton st, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before July 16, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Monday, July 31, at 11, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.
British Chemical and Agricultural Manure Company (S. E. Crow and Co.), Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented June 14, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon on Saturday, June 24. Harrison and Co, Bedford row, solicitors for the petitioner.
Direct Iron and Steel Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented June 12, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on June 30. Ingle and Co, Threadneedle st, agents for Julian, Barslom, solicitor for the petitioners.
Great Mountain Silver Lead Mining Company, Limited.—V.C. Malins has, by an order dated May 26, appointed John Henry Tilly, Victoria buildings, Queen Victoria st, to be official liquidator.

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

Borough of Ashton-under-Lyne Permanent £10 Money Club and Loan Society.—By an order made by the V.C., dated June 13, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Toy and Broadbent, Ashton-under-Lyne, solicitors for the petitioners.

TUESDAY, June 20, 1876.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

British Architect Publishing Company, Limited.—Petition for continuing the voluntary winding up, presented June 16, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on June 30. Torr and Co, Bedford row, agents for sale and Co, Manchester, solicitors for the petitioners.
British Chemical and Agricultural Manure Company (S. E. Crow and Co.), Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented June 20, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon on Saturday, July 1. Harrison and Co, Bedford row, solicitors for the petitioner.
British Guardian Life Assurance Company, Limited.—V.C. Hall has fixed June 30, at 12, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator.
Esparto Fibre Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented June 17, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on June 30. Milesbury, Fenchurch buildings, solicitors for the petitioners.
London and Provincial Consolidated Coal Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented June 17, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on June 30. Cooke and Jones, Serjeants' inn, Chancery lane, solicitors for the petitioners.
Oriental Telegram Agency, Limited.—Creditors in England are required, on or before July 14, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Louis Wells, Frederick Moll, Arthur Gilbert, and Henry Kendrick, Leadenhall st. Friday, July 24, at 11, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.
Thermo Electric Generator Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented June 16, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Saturday, July 1. Davis and Co, Moorgate st, solicitors for the petitioners.
Wembley, Sudbury, and Alperton Estates Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented June 16, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on June 30. Cutler and Co, King st, St James's, solicitors for the petitioners.

Yorkshire Civil Service Supply Association, Limited.—The M.R. has fixed Thursday, June 29, at 12, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator.

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

Hive Cotton Spinning and Velvet Manufacturing Company, Limited.—By an order made by the V.C., dated June 13, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Fosnoby and Carlile, Oldham, solicitors for the petitioners.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

TUESDAY, June 20, 1876.

Bucknall Prospect Lodge of Miners' Society, Travellers' Rest, Bucknall, Stafford. June 15
Prince of Wales Friendly Society, King's Arms, Sheffield. June 16
Second Reformed Benefit Society, Droitwich, the Ark, Droitwich, Worcester. June 15
United Kalscher Society, 5, Steward st. June 15

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, June 2, 1876.

Giles, Frederick, and Netlam John Giles, Dudley Port, Stafford, Iron Masters. June 29. Hopkins v Firmstone, V.C. Bacon.
 Walker, Stourbridge
 Hudson, Joseph, Milton st, Cripplegate, Carman. June 30. Steward v Hudson, M.R. East, Sion College, London wall
 Mitchell, Muirhead, Pall mall, June 30. Bowyer v Dignum, V.C. Hall. Maples and Co, Frederick's place, Old Jewry
 Morgan, John, Llanillterne, Glamorgan, Timber Merchant. June 21. Lewis v Jervis, V.C. Malins. Williams, Cardiff
 Richards, James, St Columb, Cornwall, Innkeeper. June 26. Gill v Richards, V.C. Malins. Whitefield, St. Columb
 Woodman, William, Rotherfield st, Islington, Licensed Victualler. June 27. Godfrey v Woodman, V.C. Bacon. Russell, Queen st, Cannon st

TUESDAY, June 6, 1876.

Archer-Burton, James Gubbins, Constantinople, Turkey. June 30.
Archer-Burton v Archer-Burton, V.C. Hall. Langley and Gibboa, Great James st, Bedford row
Arnold, Ann, Tavistock Hotel, Covent garden. July 7. Vine v Taylor, V.C. Bacon. Valance, Essex st, Strand
Bolton, Robert, Alnwick, Northumberland, Gent. July 15. Davidson v Matthewson, V.C. Hall
Falconer, Ann, Glasgow. July 15. V.C. Hall. Watson, Bouverie st, Fleet st
Maclean, Charles Edward, Norfolk st, Park lane, Merchant. Sept 25.
Trueman v Maclean, V.C. Malins. Symson and Co, Golden square, Westminster
Outram, Thomas, Sainsland, nr Halifax, York. July 3. Ashworth v Outram, V.C. Malins. Hill, Halifax
Pitzipios, Mary, Grove End rd, St John's wood. July 1. Pitzipios v Young, V.C. Bacon. Hicks, Gray's inn square
Vincer, James, Brabourne, Kent, Farmer. July 8. Vincer v Vincer, V.C. Hall. Creery, Ashford
Williams, Edward Augustus, Bromley, Kent, Surgeon. July 5.
Williams v Acton, V.C. Malins. Pennington, New square, Lincoln's inn

TUESDAY, June 13, 1876.

Barker, Thomas Hanley, Hovingham, York, Gent. July 8. Robinson v Barker, V.C. Hall. Iliffe and Co, Bedford row
Dear, Joseph Cox, Hollenden, Kent, Esq. July 10. Serjeant v Dear, V.C. Malins. Watson, Fenchurch st
Flather, Henry, Hippodrome-cum-Brighthouse, York. Oct 25. Woolhead v Flather, V.C. Malins
Jarman, William, Nottingham, Gent. July 7. Leavers v Clayton, V.C. Hall. Enfield, Nottingham
Stanley, Rev Edmund Stanley, Bath, Somerset. July 21. McGrigor v Stanley, V.C. Hall. Attree, New inn, Strand

FRIDAY, June 16, 1876.

Gesch, Edward, Liskeard, Cornwall, Gent. July 15. Ede v Lane, V.C. Malins. Hington, Liskeard
Morrall, Abel Andrew, Studley, Warwick, Needle Manufacturer. July 6. Perks v Fevorelle, V.C. Hall. Jones, Alcester

TUESDAY, June 20, 1876.

Freeman, Miriam, Crane grove, Highbury. July 22. Freeman v Jeaffreson, V.C. Malins. Boulton and Sons, Northampton square, Clerkenwell
Harley, John, Nottingham, Wine Merchant. July 13. Lewis v Smith, M.R. Wells and Hind, Nottingham
Lindley, John, Everingham, Wakefield, York, Hotel Proprietor. July 8. Burtonshaw v Lindley, V.C. Hall. Pearson, Doncaster
Mason, Mary, New Bromley, Kent. July 8. Williams v Hodgins, M.R. Norton and Co, Victoria st, Westminster
Newman, Susan Rayner, Cambridge. July 18. Coppling v Rider, M.R. Ginn, Cambridge
Pryer, Sarah, Brockley, Suffolk, Farmer. July 21. Pryer v Barrell, V.C. Hall. Sparkes, Bury St Edmunds

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 36.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, June 13, 1876.

Barnes, Jane, Seaton Carow, Darham. June 30. Snowden, Leeds
Bad, Ernest Augustus, William, Worthing, Sussex, Carver. Aug 10.
Brandon, Essex st, Strand
Blair, Louis, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset. July 1. Smith, Weston-super-Mare
Brigg, Elizabeth, Lower Marsh, Lambeth. July 18. Ford and Ford
Howard st, Strand

Clark, John, Brockley, Kent, Gent. July 12. Lea, Old Jewry chambers
 Coates, Joseph, Eytton, Hereford, Gent. July 31. Woodhouse, Leominster
 Davies, Robert, Southport, Lancashire, Gent. Aug 7. Bartlett and Atkinson, Liverpool
 Gill, Nicholas, Truro, Cornwall, Draper. Aug 3. Smith and Paul, Truro
 Glover, Christopher, Charlton, Sussex, Farmer. Aug 10. Sowton, Chichester
 Gurney, Sarah, Langley, Bucks. July 26. Gant, Walbrook
 Holmes, Thomas Turner, Bowness, Westmorland, Cabinet Maker. Aug 1. Dobson, Bowness
 Jenson, Mary, Northampton. Sept 1. Dennis and Faulkner, Northampton
 James, Joseph, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset, Builder. July 1. Smith, Weston-super-Mare
 Margary, Augustus Raymond, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset, Esq. Sept 16. Baker and Co, Weston-super-Mare
 Monk, George, Bristol, Builder. July 6. Bowles, Bristol
 Pickford, James, Brighton, Sussex. July 17. Onions, Middle st, Brighton
 Potter, Michael, Manchester, Solicitor. July 29. Potter and Lowe, Manchester
 Right, Amelia, Pennistone gardens, Shepherd's bush. July 15. Rendall, Bedford row
 Shaw, Charles, Hartford, Cheshire, Builder. July 31. Fletcher, Northwich
 Sperrin, Mary, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset. July 1. Smith, Weston-super-Mare
 Stranders, David Joseph, Argyll st, Regent st, Commission Agent. July 17. Stronge, Jewin st
 Taylor, Joseph, Margate, Kent, Gent. July 15. Flaggate and Co, Craven st, Strand
 Thwaite, Richard, Bradford, York, Woollen Draper. Aug 1. Roberts Worcester
 Wanklyn, Arthur, Leek, Stafford, Physician. Sept 12. Redfern and Son, Leek
 Wells, Joseph, Eckington Hall, Derby, Coal Master. Aug 1. Wake and Sons, Sheffield
 West, Rev John Thomas Elliot, Stoke, nr Chester. Aug 5. Bridgman and Co, Chester
 Whitting, Sarah, Uphill, Somerset. July 8. Smith, Weston-super-Mare
 Williams, Maria, Bristol. July 22. Gregory and Son Bristol
 Wright, Ann, Hereford. Aug 10. James and Bodenham, Hereford

FRIDAY, June 16, 1876.

Arthur, John, Commercial rd east, Surgeon. Aug 21. Lewis and Watson, Gracechurch st
 Atkinson, Richard, Temple Sowerby, Westmorland, Esq. Aug 1. Heelis, Appleby
 Barrow, Eliza, Park rd, Hackney. July 31. William Chapman Barrow, Fitzroy st, Fitzroy square
 Best, Harriet, Boxley, near Maidstone, Kent. Aug 1. Park and Co, Essex st, Strand
 Biggs, Louisa Maria, Queen's rd, St John's wood. July 26. Heather and Son, Paternoster row
 Browning, Benjamin, Trentham terrace, Grove rd, Mile End rd, Surgeon. Aug 14. Lewis and Co, Old Jewry
 Bullen, George, Judd st, Euston rd, Letterfounder. Aug 1. Buchanan and Rogers, Basinghall st
 Bury, Charles, Snows, Nazing, Essex, Esq. June 24. Longbourne, Lincoln's inn fields
 Chew, Samuel, Wood st, Champside, Gold Refiner. July 10. Chew, Brunswick square, Camberwell
 Christy, Alfred, Apleford Court, Kent, Esq. July 25. Baileys and Co, Bern street
 Clement, John Turner, Ladbroke grove rd, Nottinghill, Gent. July 12. Bailey, Sloane st, Knightsbridge
 Cox, Maria, Carlisle st, Piccadilly. July 12. Bailey, Sloane st, Knightsbridge
 Coxon, Anne, Chadde, Stafford. June 21. Potter, Derby
 Currie, Arthur, Connaught place, Esq. Aug 9. Lucas and Son, Fenchurch st
 Cussans, Richard, Cumberland st, Hackney rd, Compositor. Aug 14. Donne and Co, Prince's st, Spitalfields
 Edgar, Henry Ingle, Coombe Warren, Kingston-on-Thames, Sub-Lieut. R.N. July 31. Carr and Co, Basinghall st
 Elmes, James, Cranleigh, Surrey, Yeoman. July 8. Capron and Sparks, Guildford
 Fagan, James Martin, Ormskirk, Lancaster, Veterinary Surgeon. Sept 1. Bradley and Steinfirth, Ormskirk
 Gny, Charles, Pear tree green, near Southampton, Gent. Aug 10. Sowton, Chichester
 Hammond, William, Farnival's inn, Solicitor. Sept 10. Paine and Co, Farnival's inn
 Harris, George, Stourport, Worcester, Esq. Aug 12. Brockman and Harrison, Folkestone
 Hewes, Janet Thomas, Camberwell New rd, Gent. July 24. Cole and Jackson, Essex st, Strand
 Hooley, James, Chester, Tallow Chandler. July 22. Barker and Hignett, Chester
 Horsley, Howard, Liverpool, Gent. July 1. Mason, Liverpool
 Hurton, John, Covenham, Lincoln, Farmer. July 10. Allison, Louth
 Kenzie, William, Pontonville rd, Gent. July 31. Church and Co, Bedford row
 King, John, De Beauvoir rd, Kingland, Meat Salesman. Aug 1. Buchanan and Rogers, Basinghall st
 Lazenby, William Howard Harvey, Dulwich common, Surrey, Esq. Aug 1. Silvester and Son, Beverley
 Leigh, George Henry John, Cambridge terrace, Hyde park, Esq. Aug 1. White and Co, Whitehall place
 Lewis, Daniel Says, Brynmawr, Brecon, Gent. July 4. Colborne and Ward, Newport, Mon
 Lewis, Mary Ann, Clarendon terrace, Bow. July 20. Baylis and Co Church court chambers, Old Jewry

Lewis, Edward John, King's rd, Bedford row, Wine Merchant. Aug 31. Storey, King's rd, Bedford row
 Moore, Edward, New Windsor, Berks, Dentist. Aug 12. Darvill and Co, New Windsor
 Moore, Francis, Adelaide rd, St John's wood, Gent. July 31. Baker and Nairne, Crosby square
 Phillips, Susannah, Mount Radford, St Leonard, Devon. Aug 11. Truscott, Exeter
 Rideout, William Jackson, Charles st, Berkeley square, Esq. Aug 16. Rushdon and Co, Bolton-le-Moors
 Roberts, Robert, Oswestry, Salop, Gent. Aug 1. Minshall and Jones, Oswestry
 Saunders, John James, St Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex, Gent. July 31. Chauntrell and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
 Scrimshaw, William, South grove, Peckham, Tailor. Aug 1. Harvey, Old Jewry
 Serepe, George Poulett, Cobham, Surrey, Esq. July 15. Wordsworth and Co, South Sea House, Threadneedle st
 Sherman, Edward, Blandon terrace, Streatham common, Gent. Sept 16. Greene and Mellor, Huntingdon
 Slater, George, Doncaster, York, Ironmonger. Aug 21. Collinson and Doncaster
 Sullivan, Ann, Robert st, Regent's park. July 31. Barker, St Michael's House, Corahill
 Thredder, James, Great Tower st, Commission Agent. July 31. Clutton and Haines, Serjeants' inn, Fleet st
 Tice, Louisa, Bridgewater, Somerset, Dress Maker. July 24. Meade-King and Biggs, Bristol
 Tomson, Whitebread, Kensington gardens square, Esq. Sept 1. Stevens and Co, Coleman st
 Watkins, Watkins, Machen, Monmouth, Innkeeper. July 4. Colborne and Ward, Newport
 Weddell, George, Yarm, York, Gent. Aug 1. Vizard and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
 Wilkes, Thomas Hastings, Sussex, Victualler. July 12. Thomas Courtenay, Queen's rd, Peckham
 Williams, John Lloyd, Liverpool, Gent. Sept 1. Bradley and Steinfirth, Liverpool

TUESDAY, June 20, 1876.

Baugham, Rev Thomas Alfred, Lichfield. Aug 22. Hughes and Co, Budge row, Cannon st
 Benson, John, Ambleside, Westmorland, Gent. Aug 1. Fisher and Gately, Ambleside
 Brown, George, Carlisle, Ironmonger. Aug 1. Wright and Brown, Carlisle
 Butler, Rhodes, Willoughby-with-Sloothby, Lincoln, Labourer. July 28. Mason, Alford
 Calderbank, John, Altrincham, Cheshire, Stone Mason. July 20. Brownell, Altrincham
 Carr, Robert, Felkington, Northumberland, Farmer. Aug 2. Weddell, Berwick-upon-Tweed
 Goodham, John, Rochester, Kent, Cowkeeper. July 1. Bassett, Rochester
 Graham, Julia Anna, Lansdowne rd, Kensington park. Aug 1. Hardy and Rhodes, Great Marlborough st
 Gray, Edward, Liverpool, School Manager. July 7. Lynch and Tebbay, Liverpool
 Hammerton, Thomas Edward, Stansfeld, Halifax, Gent. Aug 31. Gould, Tadmorden
 Hanson, William, Huddersfield, York, Publican. July 2. Ainsley, Huddersfield
 Hartley, James, Wortley, Leeds, Woollen Cloth Manufacturer. Oct 1. Turner, Leeds
 Hempstead, Emma, Wantage, Berks. Aug 5. Ormond, Wantage
 Howe, William Daniel, Cambridge st, Pimlico, Gent. Aug 5. Marriott and Jordan, Westminster chambers, Victoria st
 Holmes, David, Dukinfield, Cheshire, Colliery Underlooker. Aug 1. Booth, Dukinfield
 Henry, Rev Peter Frye, Ryder st, St James's, Doctor of Laws. Aug 1. Iliff-Russell, Bedford row
 Justier, Louisa Anne, Market Drayton, Salop. July 17. Heane, Newport
 Livett, Henry, Bristol, Solicitor. Aug 1. Brittan and Co, Bristol
 Rowry, Rev Thomas Barnes, Watermillcote, Cumberland. Aug 15. Robinson and Watson, Carlisle
 Morgan, Mary, Ux, Monmouth. Aug 2. Gustard, Ux
 Mower, Nathaniel James Fensdale, Sheffield, Wine Merchant. July 31. Rodgers and Co, Sheffield
 Nimmo, Thomas Henry, Sandwith, Cumberland, Pawnbroker. July 20. Williams, Liverpool
 Parkyn, George Pentire, Bodmin, Cornwall, Gent. July 14. Edmund Farnall, St Austell
 Potter, Priscilla, Shegry, Nottingham. Aug 1. Bryan, Mansfield
 Rastick, John Alfred, Woolwich common, Kent, Chemist. July 31. Edgcombe and Cole, Farnes
 Royle, John, Stockport Ekehill, Cheshire, Farmer. Aug 1. Vaughan, Cheshire
 Sanders, Mary, Middlesex Hospital, Charles st. July 31. Johnson and Co, Austinfriars
 Stockham, Thomas, Southampton, Boat Builder. Aug 10. Hickman and Son, Southampton
 Wild, Ernest William, Finchley rd, Esq. July 31. Marchant and Furvis, George yard, Lombard st
 Williams, William, Fennyngydd, Flint, Miner. July 20. Sherratt, Wrexham

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, June 16, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Lee, William, Old Change, Mantle Manufacturer. Pet June 14. Spring-Rice. June 27 at 1

Walker, William Mott, Cardington st, Easton square, Medical Assistant. Pet June 14. Spring-Rice. June 27 at 13.30

To Surrender in the Country.

Bird, Walter, Navenby, Lincoln, Farmer. Pet June 13. Uppley. Lincoln, July 11 at 13.
Cartwright, Peter, Oldham, Lancashire, Skip Maker. Pet June 14. Twardale. Oldham, June 29 at 11.
Dawson, Newark Shipley, Pendleton, Lancashire, Tailor. Pet June 14. Hulston. Salford, July 12 at 11.
Granger, Thomas, Whitby, York, Innkeeper. Pet June 13. Crosby. Stockton-on-Tees, June 30 at 11.30.
Howard, John, West Bridgford, Nottingham, Farmer. Pet June 12. Patchitt. Nottingham, June 28 at 10.
Pearson, William Billatt, Salford, Lancashire, Coach Builder. Pet June 14. Hulston. Salford, July 12 at 11.
Roberts, Sir Randall Howland, Kingston-on-Thames, Surrey, Bart. Pet June 8. Bell. Kingston, June 29 at 3.
Whittaker, Alfred, Bury, Lancashire, Cabinet Maker. Pet June 12. Holden. Bolton, June 29 at 11.

TOESDAY, June 20, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Endall, James Richard, Cherry tree court, Aldersgate st, Paper Merchant. Pet June 17. Brougham. July 5 at 1.
Sawyer, Arthur Graham, Baker st, Lloyd square, Clerk to a Solicitor. Pet June 15. Keene. July 3 at 11.

To Surrender in the Country.

Cooke, John, Leeds, Merchant. Pet June 14. Marshall. Leeds, July 5 at 11.
Gilbert, William, Lichfield, Innkeeper. Pet June 15. Clarke. Walsall, July 3 at 11.
Good, Alfred, Droitwich, Worcester, Stationer. Pet June 17. Crisp. Worcester, July 4 at 12.
Payne, Robert William, Liverpool, Ship Chandler. Pet June 16. Watson. Liverpool, July 4 at 11.
Pickering, Ralph, Alston, Cumberland, Draper. Pet June 14. Halton. Carlisle, July 4 at 11.
Pine, William, Brixham, Devon, Fish Salesman. Pet June 17. Edmonds. Eastbourne, July 1 at 12.
Prescott, Thomas Churchill, Bristol, Bookseller. Pet June 19. Harley. Bristol, July 1 at 12.
Sams, Thomas, Glatton, Huntingdon, Farmer. Pet June 17. Gaches. Peterborough, July 1 at 11.
Sanderson, Mrs, High st, Putney. Pet June 13. Willoughby. Wandsworth, July 7 at 11.
Tempest, Joseph Waite, Halifax, York, Commercial Traveller. Pet June 16. Rankin. Halifax, July 6 at 11.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, June 16, 1876.

Cartwright, Peter, Oldham, Lancashire, Skip Maker. June 15
Dames, Charles Richard, Ironbridge, Salop, Wine Merchant. June 7
Ellis, Robert, Staple Leys, Huddersham, Cambridgeshire, Farmer. Feb 21
Smith, John, Larrington, Hereford, Sheep Salesman. April 27
Suffield, Henry, Hedgesford, Stafford, Surgeon. May 17

TUESDAY, June 20, 1876.

Brown, Robert, Buckingham rd, Kingsland rd, no occupation. June 15
Robertson, Samuel Boxhill, New inn, Strand, Solicitor. June 19

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, June 16, 1876.

Abrahams, Israel, Palace terrace, Muswell rd, Hornsey, Newspaper Proprietor. June 28 at 1 at offices of Harrison, Fowke's buildings, Great Tower st.
Alderson, Stephen, Rusholme, nr Manchester, Grocer. June 28 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester.
Allison, Charles, Lincoln, Tobaccoist. June 28 at 11 at offices of Page, jun, Flaxen gate, Lincoln.
Atney, John, High Traumber, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Coal Agent. July 1 at 2.30 at offices of Ellis, Eastgate st, Chester.
Bages, Charles Stephen, Mordun st, Stockwell, Commission Agent. June 30 at 2 at offices of Bryant, Winchester House, Old Broad st.
Barrett, Alfred, Bradford-on-Avon, Wilt, Baker. July 5 at 12 at offices of Grey, Market House, Trowbridge.
Barrett, Martha, Lancaster, Fish Dealer. June 28 at 12 at offices of Welch, Castle hill, Lancaster.
Beddingfield, Sydney Soames, Swansea, Glamorgan, Tobaccoist. June 27 at 11 at offices of Barnard and Co, Albion chambers, Bristol. Cox, Swansea.
Bingham, Alexander, Sheffield, Boot Maker. June 30 at 2 at offices of Taylor, Norfolk row, Sheffield.
Binnington, Robert, Thornton, York, Farmer. June 29 at 3 at offices of Woods, Pavement, York.
Bradley, John, Scarborough, York, out of business. June 23 at 3 at offices of Wellburn, Hantrias row, Scarborough.
Brousson, Maurice, Eugene Wagner, and Henry Walter Oliphant-Collingwood, Fitchurch st, Merchants. June 26 at 12 at the City Terminus Hotel, Cannon st. Beck, East India avenue.
Cardwell, Francis, Bailey, York, Carrier. July 3 at 4 at offices of Wooler, Exchange buildings, Bailey.
Chappell, Joseph Hygrave, Southsea, Hants, Draper. June 26 at 3 at offices of Andrews and Mason, Ironmonger lane, Cheapside, Way, Portsea.
Chavasse, George Desley, Motley, Wednesbury, Stafford, Grocer. June 29 at 11 at offices of Corbett, Pinfold st, Darlaston.
Chisholm, George, Chillingham New Town, Northumberland, Farmer. June 27 at 3 at the King's Arms Inn, Berwick-upon-Tweed. Middlemas, Alnwick.

Clark, John, Middlesborough, York. June 20 at 2.30 at offices of Scotland, Zealand rd, Middlesborough.
Clarke, William Shirley, Stroud, Gloucester, Fishmonger. June 29 at 11 at offices of Smith, George st, Stroud.
Clifton, Philip, Manchester, Draper. July 4 at 3 at the Mitre Hotel, Cathedral steps, Manchester. Clark, Oldham.
Collins, John Raistrick, Horton, nr Bradford, York, Staff Manufacturer. June 29 at 3 at offices of Wood and Killick, Commercial Bank buildings, Bradford.
Cooper, William, Cinderford, Gloucester, General Shop Keeper. July 3 at 4 at the Booth Hall Hotel, Westgate st, Gloucester. Jackson, Stroud.
Crossdale, William, Manchester, Hat Manufacturer. July 3 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester.
Davies, William, Farworth, Lancashire, Grocer. June 30 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester.
Day, Rev Vaughan Campbell, Ash Priors, Somerset. June 28 at 12 at offices of Taunton, High st, Taunton.
Edlin, Mark Haines, Ickenham, Middlesex, Farmer. July 3 at 3 at the George Inn, Uxbridge. Philip, Hayes.
Emmerson, Thomas Cant, Stockton-on-Tees, Durham, Clothier. June 29 at 3 at offices of Dodds and Co, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees. Ward, Stockton-on-Tees.
Field, William, jun, Cambridge rd, Bethnal green, Hat Manufacturer. June 30 at 3 at offices of Turner and Son, Leadenhall st.
Freeman, Mary Ann, and John Tom Freeman, Reading, Berks, Plumbers. June 28 at 11 at 17, Oxford st, Reading. Dodd, Reading.
Gibbins, William, Craven st, Strand, Balder. July 3 at 11 at offices of Powell, Pancras lane.
Glover, Joseph, Wigan, Lancashire, Licensed Victualler. June 27 at 3 at the Shakespeare Inn, King st, Wigan. Nicholson and Co, Warrington.
Hammett, John, Aberaman, Glamorgan, Innkeeper. June 30 at 11 at offices of Phillips, Maendy place, Aberdare.
Hardy, William, Gibson square, Ilkington, Accountant. June 27 at 1 at 3, Fenchurch buildings. Philby.
Harper, Joseph, Shipley, York, Groengrocer. July 4 at 2 at offices of Robinson and Robinson, Skipton, York.
Herpst, Charles, Leeds, Artist. June 30 at 3 at offices of Malcolm, Park row, Leeds.
Holmes, Mark Rucroft, Middlesborough, York, Mercer. June 27 at 11 at Anderson's Hotel, Fleet st. Addenbrooke, Middlesborough.
Hoodwood, Ernest Albert Ludwig Martens, Fenchurch st, Cattle Salesman. June 29 at 2 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Rooks and Co, King st, Cheapside.
Honeywell, George, Exeter, Cooper. July 1 at 12 at offices of Andrew, Bedford circus, Exeter.
Hughes, Owen, West Derby, nr Liverpool, Brewer. July 4 at 3 at offices of Norden, Cook st, Liverpool.
Hurlstone, William, Aston-juxta-Birmingham, Commission Agent. July 1 at 10.15 at offices of Ward, Moor st, Birmingham.
Irons, Charles, Norwich, Boot Manufacturer. June 30 at 3 at offices of Sudd and Lines, Church st, Theatre st, Norwich.
Jelly, Frederick, Kettering, Northampton, Miller. June 28 at 11.30 at offices of Rawlins and Son, Market Harborough.
Johnson, John, High Wycombe, Buckingham, Innkeeper. July 4 at 3 at offices of Parker and Son, Easton st, High Wycombe.
Jyan, Robert, Angel lane, Stratford, Essex, Cab Proprietor. June 26 at 2 at 3, Fenchurch buildings. Philby.
Kitchen, John, Dewsbury, York, Innkeeper. July 5 at 11 at offices of Walker, Wakefield rd, Dewsbury.
Lawrence, Charles, jun, Monmuth, Balder. June 30 at 2 at offices of Williams, Whitecross st, Monmouth.
Levy, Jacob, Middlesborough, York, Jeweller. June 26 at 3 at offices of Teale, Albert rd, Middlesborough.
Lock, Samuel, Swansea, Glamorgan, Joiner. July 1 at 3 at offices of Thomas, Rutland st, Swansea.
Loving, Philip, Bristol, Grocer. June 29 at 11 at offices of Meares, John st, Broad st, Bristol.
Mason, John James, Manchester, Skirt Manufacturer. June 30 at 3 at offices of Sale and Co, Booth st, Manchester.
May, John, Brighton, Sussex, Tailor. June 30 at 1 at 12, Newgate st. Maynard, Brighton.
Moore, George, Filleigh, Devon, Blacksmith. June 26 at 2 at offices of Chanter and Co, Bridge Hall chambers, Barnstaple.
Morgan, Philip Frederick, Hertford st, Haggerston rd, Dalston, Boot Manufacturer. July 1 at 11 at offices of Archer, Globe rd, Mile end.
Nicholson, Archibald, Birmingham, Draper. June 27 at 12 at offices of Fallowa, Cherry st, Birmingham.
Nicholson, James, Gateshead, Durham, Grocer. June 27 at 10 at offices of Wallace, Hutton chambers, Pilgrim st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Orgill, Francis, Ilkerton, Derby, Beerhouse Keeper. June 30 at 11 at offices of Briggs, Amen alley, Derby.
Parker, John Fowler, Lincoln, Shoe Maker. June 24 at 11 at offices of Page, jun, Flaxen gate, Lincoln.
Parnum, Thomas, Worcester, Butcher. July 3 at 3 at offices of Pitt, The Avenue, Cross, Worcester.
Pearson, Joseph, Autrey, Warwick, Publican. June 28 at 3 at the Bricklayers' Arms, George st, Tamworth. Hawkes and Weekes, Birmingham.
Pearson, William, jun, Wirksworth, Derby, Grocer. June 30 at 3 at offices of Briggs, Amen alley, Derby.
Polson, James, Tunstall, Stafford, Grocer. June 26 at 3 at offices of Alcock, Market st, Tunstall.
Pritchard, Peter, Fenchurch st, Ammunition Manufacturer. July 3 at 11 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Wilson and Son, Bathgate st.
Pulham, William Whitlam, Framlingham, Suffolk, Grocer. July 7 at 2 at offices of Pollard, St Lawrence st, Ipswich.
Rees, Shadrach Price, Ystrad, nr Pontypridd, Glamorgan, Builder. June 29 at 12.30 at offices of Simons and Pies, Church st, Merthyr Tydfil.
Raynolds, Thomas, Liverpool, Hatter. July 6 at 3 at offices of Connor, Ranelagh st, Liverpool. Norden, Liverpool.
Ringold, Levi, Manchester, Draper. July 10 at 4 at offices of East, Lower King st, Manchester.

Robinson, Anthony George, Mark lane, Ship Agent. July 6 at 3 at the City Terminus Hotel, Cannon st. Cattars and Co, Mark lane
Bowley, Mary Ann, Brighton, Sussex, Milliner. June 30 at 3 at offices of Nye, North st, Brighton
Rannacles, Harcourt, Halstead, Essex, Builder. June 29 at 12 at the Law Institution, Chancery lane. Harris and Morton, Halstead
Ryland, Howard, Birmingham, Wholesale Stationer. June 29 at 11 at offices of Rowlands, Ann st, Birmingham
Sanson, Edwin, Mansfield, Nottingham, Cabinet Maker. July 3 at 3 at offices of Lees, jun, Middle pavement, Nottingham
Serrie, William, Bude, Cornwall, Gent. June 28 at 3 at the New Inn, Bideford. Bancart, Barnstaple
Sharp, Charles, Swansea, Glamorgan, Grocer. June 28 at 3 at offices of Field, Adelaide chambers, Swansea
Sharp, Henry James, Widnes, Lancashire, Solicitor's Clerk. June 30 at 12 at the Clarendon Hotel, Oxford st, Manchester. Husband, Widnes
Shenton, Thomas, Tivdals, Stafford, Brickyard Manager. June 26 at 11 at offices of Stokes, Priory st, Uddley
Sigwick, Joseph, Low Spenny Moor, Durham. June 27 at 11 at offices of Sader, Newgate st, Bishop Auckland
Slins, John, Fildwell, Gloucester, Tea Dealer. July 3 at 2 at the Grand Hotel, Broad st, Bristol. Hurd, Berkeley
Smith, Henry, Duke st, Southwark, Glass Merchant. June 30 at 12 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Thomson and Edwards, Lotherbury
Stratford, Mary, Middlesborough, York, out of business. June 28 at 11 at offices of Thornton, Whiby
Tant, William Henry, Worcester, Carpenter. June 29 at 11 at offices of Stallard, Pierpoint st, Worcester
Taylor, William Samuel, Derby, out of business. June 29 at 2 at the Commercial Sale Room, Waynflete, Derby
Thickett, Alfred, and William Roberts Road, Cies, Lincoln, Ship Builders. June 27 at 11 at offices of Stephenson and Mountain, Bethlehem st, Great Grimsby
Thomas, Evan, Bridgend, Glamorgan, Grocer. June 29 at 12 at offices of Stockwood, jun, Bridgend
Thompson, James, Liverpool, Draper. July 5 at 3 at offices of Ryalnce and Barker, Essex st, Manchester
Troughon, John William, Blackfriars rd, Printer. July 12 at 3 at offices of Gregson, Angel court, Throgmorton st
Turnbull, Thomas, Edmondwall, Durham, Tailor. June 30 at 19 at offices of Grange, Sadler st, Durham
Turner, George, Nantwich, Cheshire, Publican. July 3 at 1 at the Royal Hotel, Crewe, Brooks, Nantwich
Urch, Frederick, Bristol, Jam Manufacturer. June 27 at 3 at offices of Beckingham, Albion chambers, Broad st, Bristol
Van Gelderen, Jacques Manuel, Middlesborough, York, Surgeon Dentist. June 30 at 3 at offices of Addenbrooke, Zetland rd, Middlesborough
Velch, William James, Torquay, Devon, Nurseryman. June 30 at 12 at offices of Fawcings, Queen st, Exeter
Wickawell, George Francis, Birmingham, Commercial Clerk. June 27 at 11 at offices of Duke Temple row, Birmingham
Wader, Peter, Fulborough, Sussex, Blacksmith. June 30 at 4 at the Swan Hotel, Fulborough. Mant, Storrington
Walker, Henry, Gomersal, York, Hay Dealer. June 29 at 3 at offices of Shaw, Bond st, Dewsbury
Wright, James Augustus, Moray rd, Holloway, Gent. July 3 at 11 at offices of Eley, New Broad st
Weller, Charles John, Mordon, Surrey, Baker. June 28 at 3 at offices of Streeter, High st, Croydon
Whiteman, William, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Boot Maker. July 3 at 2 at offices of Hannon and Pugh, Duncun st, Birkenhead
Wilkins, Thomas, Laughton, Carmarthen, Victualler. July 1 at 10 at offices of Green and Griffiths, St Mary st, Carmarthen
Winfield, John, Leeds, Manner Manufacturer. June 28 at 3 at offices of Crowther, Bear lane, Leeds

TUESDAY, June 30, 1876.

Aldridge, Mark Reuben, Salford, Lancashire, Greengrocer. July 3 at 3 at offices of Sampson, South King st, Manchester
Armstrong, William, Down place, King st, Hammermith, Draper. July 11 at 4.30 at Ridler's Hotel, Holborn. Yerke, Marylebone rd
Beecham, John, Sheffield, Provision Merchant. July 3 at 12 at offices of Mellor, Bank st, Sheffield
Booth, Jonathan Debon, Lythe, York, out of business. June 30 at 11 at offices of Dobson, Middlesborough
Braun, Isidor, Wood st, Shipper. July 3 at 3 at offices of Dubois, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st. Murray, Langham st, Portland place
Breton, Stewart, Liverpool, Plumber. June 30 at 3 at offices of Ritson, Dale st, Liverpool
Brookes, Robert William, Swansea, Glamorgan, General Dealer. June 29 at 3 at offices of Thomas, Rutland st, Swansea
Browne, James, Manchester, Salesman. July 4 at 10 at offices of Sale and Co, Booth st, Maccleshton
Bullen, Joseph, Liverpool, Brewer. July 4 at 2 at offices of Harris, Union court, Liverpool
Campbell, Alexander, Forbury, nr Liverpool, Book keeper. July 10 at 3 at offices of Ponton, Vernon chambers, Vernon st, Liverpool
Cantie, William, Southern, Hants, Ironmonger. July 6 at 3 at offices of Treccitt and Gane, Bishopsgate at within
Clarke, Alfred David, Erith, Kent, Plumber. July 6 at 2 at offices of Poole, Bartholomew close
Clybourn, Joseph, Upper Thames st, Wine Merchant. July 1 at 3 at offices of Maniere, Gracechurch st
Cohen, Solomon, and Jacob Cohen, Castleford, York, Jewellers. July 7 at 11 at offices of Freeman, Barnaby
Cotton, James, Wombesbury, Stafford, out of business. July 1 at 11 at offices of Slater and Marshall, Butcher, Darlington
Cox, Edmund Beaumont, Wigmore st, Cavendish square, Manager to a Cheesemonger. July 13 at 5 at offices of Young, Newgate st
Darling, Robert, Brighton, Sussex, Music Seller. July 5 at 12 at offices of Smith and Co, Broad st, Cheapside. Lamb, Brighton
Davis, Joel, Samuel Miller Davis, and Tom Davis, Bournemouth, Hants, Builders. July 12 at 3 at the London Hotel, Poole. Marshall, Bedford row
Dawe, Henry, Edward rd, Commercial Traveller. June 30 at 4 at Ridler's Hotel, Holborn. Yerke, Marylebone rd

Dickon, Richard, Liverpool, Tea Merchant. July 4 at 2 at offices of Collins and Robinson, Brunswick st, Liverpool
Dixon, George, jun, Scarborough, York, Music Seller. June 30 at 11 at offices of Richardson, Queen st, Scarborough
Dixon, John, Wigton, Cumberland, Boot Maker. June 30 at 11 at offices of McKeever, Wigton
Danton, William Fletcher, Gaston terrace, Horsaey rise, Dairyman. July 13 at 3 at offices of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd, Islington. Fenton
Entwistle, Kenben, Haugh, nr Bolton, Lancashire, Salesman. July 3 at 3 at offices of Dawson, Wood st, Bolton
Forrest, John, Cassop, Durham, Grocer. July 12 at 12 at offices of Chambers, Sadler st, Durham
Foster, Thomas, Hastings, Sussex, Tobacconist. June 3 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st, in lieu of the place originally named
Freer, John, Bournemouth, Hants, Cabinet Maker. July 4 at 2 at 16, Bedford row, Helborn
Garbutt, John Henry, King William st, Coal Owner. July 4 at 3 at the City Terminus Hotel, Cannon st. Miller and Smith
Gumbrell, Mark, Crawley, Sussex, Draper. July 6 at 2 at the Bridge House Hotel, London bridge. Black and Co, Brighton
Halam, William, Northampton, Boot Manufacturer. July 3 at 12 at the Angel Hotel, Northampton. Ashdown, Northampton
Harrison, Catharine Torgoose, Stamford, Lincoln, Publican. June 3 at 11 at the Stamford Hotel, Stamford. Law, Stamford
Harrison, Levi, Old Radford, Nottingham, Miller. July 3 at 3 at offices of Oranch and Stroud, Low pavement, Nottingham
Havercroft, Thomas, Kirmington, Lincoln, Butcher. June 3 at 3 at the Marrow Bone and Cleaver Inn, Kirmington. Walker and Spink, Hull
Hawridge, Joseph, Stockport, Cheshire, Joiner. July 5 at 2.30 at offices of Brown and Ainsworth, Market place, Stockport
Hemmings, Alfred, Dewsbury Moor, York, Shoddy Merchant. July 4 at 10.30 at offices of Ridgway, Church st, Dewsbury
Hennin, Patrick, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Provision Dealer. July 2 at 3 at offices of Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-on-Tyne
Hoare, Benjamin, Staines, Middlesex, Hatter. July 5 at 3 at offices of Knox, Newgate st
Hodge, William, Gillingham, Kent, Grocer. July 3 at 11 at the Railway Hotel, Ordnance place, Chatham
Keates, Charles Alfred, Old street, Leather Seller. July 3 at 2 at offices of Downing, Basinghall st
Kinsey, Edward, Abberdale, Glamorgan, Greengrocer. July 3 at 11 at offices of Phillips, Maendy place, Abberdale
Leaver, James, jun, Blackburn, Lancashire, Draper. July 4 at 3 at the Clarence Hotel, Spring gardens, Manchester. Scott, Blackburn
Lee, Thomas William Rollings, Brighton, Sussex, Toy Dealer. June 26 at offices of Speyer and Son, Winchester House, Old Broad st, in lieu of the place originally named
Lill, Edman, Hunt-on, Lincoln, Wheelwright. July 1 at 11 at offices of Mason, Market place, Alford
Lloyd, John, Eusden, Denbigh, Farmer. July 5 at 11 at offices of Acton and Barry, Chester st, Wrexham
Lucas, Marshall, Sheldon st, Westbourne terrace, Gasfitter. July 11 at 2 at offices of Warry and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
Malpass, Thomas, Hanley, Stafford, Potter. July 3 at 11 at offices of Welch, Caroline st, Longton
Mayes, John Young, Rebbington, Cheshire, Book-keeper. July 3 at 2 at offices of Harris, Union court, Liverpool
McEntyre, John, Bradford, York, Clothier. July 3 at 11 at offices of Terry and Robinson, Market st, Bradford
McLeur, Francis, Southampton, Surgeon. July 3 at 10.45 at offices of Swayne, Portland st, Southampton
Millington, George Emery, Bliston, Stafford, Tailor. July 5 at 1.30 at of Hall, Bliston
Moore, John, Alburgh, Norfolk, Bricklayer. July 1 at 11 at offices of Stanley, Bank plain, Norwich
Morgan, John, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Grocer. July 1 at 11 at offices of Stratton and Rudland, Queen st, Wolverhampton
Murphy, Francis Clinton, North Shields, Northumberland, Plumber. June 30 at 2 at offices of Smith, Saville st, North Shields
Murrell, George Robus, Waterloo rd, Tool Dealer. June 30 at 2 at offices of Lee, Martin's lane, Cannon st
Nash, William Frederick, St. Mary Axe, American Merchant. July 20 at 2 at offices of Chubb, Pancras lane, Queen st, Cheapside
Nelson, John, Stockton-on-Tees, Durham, Stage Manager. July 3 at 3 at offices of Draper, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees
Newnam, Henry, Gloucester st, Pimlico, Publisher. June 28 at 2 at offices of Medcalf, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st. Lewis, Gresham ham buildings
Pallister, William, Middlesborough, York, Cabinet Maker. July 10 at 11 at offices of Wilkes, Zetland rd, Middlesborough
Pearri, William, Darlington, Durham, Tobacconist. July 5 at 12 at offices of Robinson, Houndgate, Darlington
Phillips, Elijah, Manchester, Beer Retailer. July 5 at 3 at offices of Law, King st, Manchester
Phillips, John, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorgan, Butcher. June 29 at 11 at offices of Simons and Pies, Church st, Merthyr Tydfil
Pike, James, South Molton st, Oxford st, Sign Writer. July 3 at 12 at 28, Southampton buildings, Chancery lane. Norris
Plietson, William, Warrington, Lancashire, Broker. July 4 at 11 at offices of Bretherton, Bank st, Warrington
Pope, Charles, Uplowman, Devon, Miller. July 4 at 11 at the Half Moon Hotel, Tiverton. Hirtzel, Exeter
Pons, George, Eastbourne, Sussex, Dyer. July 14 at 11 at offices of Perry, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st
Prait, Francis John, Tewkesbury, Gloucester, out of business. July 5 at 11 at the Swan Hotel, Alcester. Jones, Alcester
Ree, Joseph, and William Borley, Nottingham, Engineers. July 12 at 11 at the Assembly Rooms, Low pavement, Nottingham. Eversall and Turner
Selman, Francis, Handsworth, Stafford, Builder. July 3 at 3 at offices of Wright and Marshall, Town Hall chambers, New st, Birmingham
Sheppard, Charles, Lewes, Sussex, Watch Maker. July 3 at 3 at the Star Hotel, Lewes. Fensell, Brighton
Sig, George, Manchester, Engineer. July 4 at 2 at offices of Orton and Bryant, Ridgely, Manchester

Sinclair, George, Princes st. Scho. Stone Mason. July 1 at 3 at the Cannon st Hotel. O'Neill, King William at Smith, Benjamin, Lower Gornal, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. July 3 at 10.30 at the White Chimneys Inn, Lower Gornal. Gould and Elcock, Stourbridge
Smith, Frederick Henry, Westbourne park villas, Colliery Proprietor. July 5 at 2 at offices of Ingledow and Co, St Bonet chambers, Fenchurch st
Stevens, James, Swansea, Glamorgan, Butcher. June 28 at 3 at 3, Lower Goat st, Swansea. Glascombe, Swansea
Stocker, Edwin [John Francis, Cardiff, out of business. July 4 at 11 at offices of Morgan, High st, Cardiff
Summers, Emanuel, Worcester. Cooper. June 28 at 3 at offices of Corbett, Avenue House, The Cross, Worcester
Sutton, William Goodwin, Mansfield, Nottingham, Tailor. July 3 at 12 at offices of Parsons, Eldon chambers, Wheelergate, Nottingham
Switchebank, Isaac, Bradford, York, Journeyman Joiner. July 1 at 10 at offices of Berry and Robinson, Charles st, Bradford
Taylor, Robert, Portsea, Hants, Builder. July 3 at 3 at offices of Harvey, Hanover st, Portsea
Taylor, Thomas, Bicester, Stafford, Druggist. July 1 at 10.30 at offices of Baker, Bridge st, Walsall
Thomas, Daniel, Pontypriid, Glamorgan, Draper. July 6 at 11 at offices of Morgan, High st, Cardiff
Thomas, John, Hednall, Salop, Innkeeper. June 30 at 11 at the George Hotel, Shrewsbury. Bygott, Wem, Salop
Tomblings, George Griffith, Hereford, out of business. July 4 at 11 at offices of Corner, High Town, Hereford
Tordoff, Peter, Bradford, York, Cabinet Maker. July 3 at 3 at offices of Peel and Gaunt, Chapel lane, Bradford
Trask, Henry, Sherborne, Dorset, Walthamst. July 1 at 12 at the Salisbury Hotel, Salisbury square, Fleet st. Davies, Sherborne
Turnbull, Thomas, Edmondsey, Durham, Tailor. June 30 at offices of Wallace, Hutton chambers, Fligim st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, in lieu of the place originally named
Turner, Enoch, Hanley, Stafford, Commission Agent. June 29 at 11 at offices of Tennant, Cheapside, Hanley
Walker, Anne, Leeds, Lodging House Keeper. July 4 at 3 at offices of Malcolm, Park row, Leeds
Walker, John, Nottingham, Jewellery Dealer. July 3 at 12 at offices of Smith, Fitchgate, Nottingham
Weaver, John, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Boot Maker. July 6 at 11 at offices of Stanley, Washington buildings, Queen st, Wolverhampton
White, George Herberton, Landport, Hants, Grocer. July 3 at 11.30 at offices of Ford and Son, St Thomas' st, Portsmouth
Williams, Benjamin, Dowlais, Glamorgan, Grocer. June 29 at 11 at offices of Lewis, Glebe st, St. Merthyr Tydfil
Winna, Henry, Farworth, Lancashire, Builder. July 3 at 11 at offices of Healey, Acresfield, Bolton. Northgraves
Wood, Charles, Newport, Monmouth, Brewer. July 3 at 11 at offices of Morgan, Dock st, Newport

EDE AND SON.

ROBE MAKERS.

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS &c
ESTABLISHED 1669.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

THE AGRA BANK (LIMITED)

Established in 1833.—Capital, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS-LANE, LOMBARD-STREET, LONDON.

BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

CURRENT ACCOUNTS are kept at the Head Office on the terms customary with London bankers, and interest allowed when the credit balance does not fall below £100.

DEPOSITS received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.—At 5 per cent. per annum, subject to 12 months' notice of withdrawal for shorter periods deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.

BILLS issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank free of extra charge; and approved bills purchased or sent for collection.

SALES AND PURCHASES effected in British and foreign securities, in East India Stock and loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken. Interest drawn, and army, navy, and civil pay and pensions realised. Every other description of banking business and money agency British and Indian, transacted.

J. THOMSON, Chairman.

REVERSIONARY AND LIFE INTERESTS in

Landed or Funded Property or other Securities and ANNUITIES purchased, or Loans thereon granted, by the

EQUITABLE REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY

10, LANCASTER-PLACE, WATERLOO-BRIDGE, STRAND,

Established 1835. Paid-up Capital, £400,000.

If required interest on Loans may be capitalised.

F. S. CLAYTON, } Joint
C. H. CLAYTON, } Secretaries.

THE LONDON ASSURANCE CORPORATION.

FOR FIRE, LIFE, AND MARINE ASSURANCES.

(Incorporated by Royal Charter, A.D. 1720.)

Office—No. 7, ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON, E.C.

WEST-END AGENTS:

Messrs. GRINDLAY & Co., 55, Parliament-street, S.W.

Governor—ROBERT GILLESPIE, Esq.

Sub-Governor—EDWARD BUDD, Esq.

Deputy-Governor—MARK WILKS COLLET, Esq.

Directors.

Hugh Gough Arbuthnot, Esq.
Robert Burn Blyth, Esq.
William Thomas Brand, Esq.
Major-General H. P. Burn.
George William Campbell, Esq.
George B. Dewhurst, Esq.
Robert B. Dobree, Esq.
Geo. Louis Monck Gibbs, Esq.
Howard Gilliat, Esq.
Henry Goschen, Esq.
Edwin Gower, Esq.
A. C. Guthrie, Esq.

Louis Huth, Esq.
Henry J. B. Kendall, Esq.
Charles Lyall, Esq.
Capt. R. W. Pelly, R.N.
David Powell, Esq.
William Rennie, Esq.
P. F. Robertson, Esq.
Robert Ryrie, Esq.
David P. Sellar, Esq.
Col. Leopold Seymour.
Lewis A. Wallace, Esq.
William B. Watson, Esq.

Solitors.

Messrs. Johnson, Upton, & Budd, & Messrs. Collyer-Bristow, Withers, & Russell, 4, Bedford-row.

FIRE DEPARTMENT.

NOTICE is hereby given to persons Assured against Fire, that the renewal receipts for Premiums due at Midsummer are ready to be delivered, and that Assurances on which the Premium shall remain unpaid after Fifteen Days from the said Quarter-day will become void. Fire Assurances can be effected with the Corporation at moderate rates of Premium.

LIFE DEPARTMENT.

Life Assurances may be effected either with or without participation in profits. Copies of the Accounts, pursuant to "The Life Assurance Companies Act, 1870" may be obtained on application.

The Directors are ready to receive applications for Agencies to the Corporation.

JOHN P. LAURENCE, Secretary.

GUARDIAN FIRE AND LIFE OFFICE,

11, Lombard-street, London, E.C.

Established 1821. Subscribed Capital, Two Millions.

DIRECTORS.

CHAIRMAN—Archibald Hamilton, Esq.

DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN—G. J. Shaw Lefevre, Esq., M.P.

Henry Hulce Berens, Esq.
Henry Bonham-Carter, Esq.
Charles Wm. Curtis, Esq.
Charles F. Devaa, Esq.
Francis Hart Dyke, Esq.
Sir Walter H. Farquhar, Bart.
Alban G. H. Gibbs, Esq.
James Goodson, Esq.
Thomson Hankey, Esq., M.P.
Richard M. Harvey, Esq.
Rt. Hon. John G. Hubbard, M.P.
Frederick H. Janson, Esq.
Beaumont W. Lubbock, Esq.
John B. Martin, Esq.
Augustus Provost, Esq.
William Steven, Esq.
John G. Talbot, Esq., M.P.
Henry Vigne, Esq.

MANAGER OF FIRE DEPARTMENT—F. J. Marsden.

ACTUARY AND SECRETARY—T. G. C. Browne.

Share Capital at present paid up and invested ... £1,000,000

Total Funds ... £3,000,000

Total Annual Income upwards of ... £400,000

N.B.—Fire Policies which expire at Midsummer should be renewed at the Head Office, or with the Agents, on or before the 9th July.

LAW UNION FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE

COMPANY. Chief Office—120, Chancery-lane, London, W.C.

The Funds in hand and Capital subscribed amount to £1,400,000 sterling.

Chairman—JAMES CUDDON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Goldsmith-building, Temple.

Deputy-Chairman—C. PEMBERTON, Esq. (Lee & Pemberton), Solicitor, 44, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Every description of Fire and Life Insurance business transacted.

The Directors invite attention to the new form of Life Policy, which is free from all conditions.

The Company advances Money on Mortgage of Life Interest and Reversions, whether absolute or contingent.

Prospectuses, Copies of the Directors' Report, and Annual Balance Sheet, and every information, sent post free, on application to

FRANK M'GEDDY, Actuary and Secretary.

LAW REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY.

24, LINCOLN'S-INN-FIELDS, W.C.

CHAIRMAN—Alfred H. Shadwell, Esq.

DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN—H. Cecil Raikes, Esq., M.P.

Reversions and Life Interests purchased, Immediate and Deferred Annuities granted in exchange for Reversionary and Contingent Interests.

Loans may also be obtained on the security of Reversions. Annuities, Immediate, Deferred, and Contingent, and also Endowments granted on favourable terms.

Prospectuses and Forms of Proposal, and all further information, may be had at the office.

C. B. CLABON, Secretary.

chers,

the
de-
un-
id.
rate

ation
anies
to the
ary.

CE,

M.P.

i.

.

000
000
000
newed

NCE
W.C
000

build.
ictor,

l.
which
e and
ance

ary.

ST

ered
in-

low-
my
ary.